The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XXXIV • DECEMBER 1948 • NUMBER 4

THE 1948 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

TRUMAN—A WINNING SPEAKER

Jennings Randolph

PRESIDENT TRUMAN qualified for the prediction made in the article appearing in the October issue that he would be 'a speaker likely to cause unpredictable trouble before the votes are finally counted on the night of November 2.'

Although others may dispute the contention I thoroughly believe that Mr. Truman tallied a high popular vote because he spoke, and spoke, and spoke to millions of his fellow Americans during more than 22,000 miles of intensive campaigning in thirty-six states.

The President spoke approximately 275 times—at least a hundred times more than his Republican opponent, Governor Dewey. Contrary to the belief expressed by that distinguished journalist, Arthur Krock of the *New York Times,* in the latter part of September that speaking by the presidential candidates would have little influence on voters who had already made up their minds, I am convinced that three to four million ballots went for the President because he was 'on the stump.' Elmo Roper and other pollsters indicated early in September that the voters were ready to vote Truman out of the White House by an overwhelming majority. How wrong they were!

Political wiseacres in both parties, trained political newsmen, and radio commentators joined the popular cry among partisan Republicans that the President was 'a beaten man before he starts.' They indicated that he would lose overwhelmingly in his efforts to retain the presidency. In the face of such discouraging advice and predictions Truman determined to take his case to the jury—the voters of the country—through the time-tested medium of public speaking.

He took to the road, delivering major addresses in the country's metropolitan centers. Most of the material used in these speeches had been carefully drafted and was read—with some side remarks—to large audiences. The majority of these speeches were carried to millions of listeners by radio.

It was the 'new look,' however, in the President's speaking that brought him the applause—and votes—of hundreds of thousands of farmers, of factory workers, and of John Smith and Mary Jones.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH *is Professor of Public Speaking at Southeastern University, Washington, D. C. He was a Member of Congress from the 2nd West Virginia District from 1933 to 1947. In this article Mr. Randolph concludes the analysis of President Truman's speaking which he began in the October 1948 issue.*

There is no denying that his rough and ready oratory created mixed reaction. At many of the so-called 'whistle stops' the crowds cheered his invectives, but at other times their 'poker faces' indicated that they did not approve his characterizations.

Joseph A. Fox, veteran political writer of the Washington (D. C.) *Star*, wrote the following analysis during the heat of the speaking campaign in October:

> President Truman probably is setting some sort of record for rough language in a presidential campaign while waging his fight for "the People vs. the Special Interests."
>
> The new Truman glossary includes such entries as "gluttons of privilege," "hogs," "economic tapeworm of big business," "crafty men," "sabotaging the West," "pitchfork in the farmer's back," "predatory animals" and so on, almost endlessly.
>
> The only way to appraise the success of the former move is to watch the reaction of Mr. Truman's hearers. This has been decidedly mixed. Often—and this was particularly noticeable at the "whistle stops" where rural audiences predominated—there was marked appreciation of his sallies, and such cries as "Pour it on." On the other side, some of the larger crowds while attentive, have "sat on their hands," as the saying goes, leaving onlookers wondering whether it was a deep interest in the presidential preachings or idle curiosity that stirred them from home. That's an imponderable that it will take November 2 to decide. The President accepts the turnouts as a sign of interest in what he now refers to as his "crusade."

Dewey was challenged to come down from his 'high level' campaign and square off in the center of the ring with the battling Truman. But the President never succeeded in causing the New York State Governor to detail specifically where he stood on the dozens of controversial issues demanding clarification. Dewey's tactics were unwise. In measured tones and sentences he generalized more than people felt he should, but he reasoned he had the presidency in his grasp. He was wrong. People wanted to hear their presidential campaigners grapple with problems in down-to-earth talks. Truman did so. They rewarded him for it.

It was an underdog Truman who kept hammering away on the sins of the 80th Congress and the evils of the Republican party. The President dwelt constantly in his utterances on 'what the Republicans have done to you,' and pungently portrayed the dreadful trouble which would befall the working men and women of America if Dewey came to Washington.

In San Francisco, I am told by a person who was there, the President harped on the theme of that city's key position as the birthplace of the United Nations. It would have been better and more productive of enthusiasm had Truman chosen the topic of communism. A strike was then in progress among maritime workers, and it appeared to be the time to state his position against the subversive elements causing disruption. But the audience of some 25,000 persons had to content itself with the 'peace' subject because the address had been carefully drafted, and it was too late to make a change.

Definite proof that the Communist issue was 'live' was borne out in the 'off the cuff' declaration by the President that a victory by the GOP would bring on an economic depression 'which in the long run will do nobody any good but the Communists.' This outburst brought heavy applause and caused Truman to tell his advisors that the blow by blow, extemporaneous speaking was the type to get results.

And so it went. Through the Midwest, the Rocky Mountain states, the West Coast, New England, and the Middle Atlantic area. Sometimes the President struck fire, and at other times misadventures were the answer to words too hastily delivered. It was a mad pace

Truman set for himself as he made six, eight, ten, and as many as twelve talks a day. He seemed to stand the back-breaking tours through long hours—and appeared confident and refreshed each new day.

He told workers that the Republican 80th Congress was just beginning to remove their rights by enacting into law the Taft-Hartley act. Housewives were told graphically that high prices were chargeable to the Truman opposition. Veterans were told that these GOP legislators had failed to provide an adequate housing program.

President Truman had begun, during the heat of the campaign, to get across to his hearers the points on which he desired their endorsement. The following Associated Press dispatch, dated October 13, from St. Paul, Minnesota, discloses a method of speaking which really gets results:

Today, the president said, the forces of liberalism face a crisis. He said there is a choice between "the wall street way of life and politics," and a Democratic program that is concrete, realistic, practical and worth believing in and fighting for.

So in what he called this "center of practical liberalism," Mr. Truman made this political appeal:

"This one fight you must get in. After November 2 it will be too late. It will do no good to change your mind on November 3. The time of decision is here.

"Against this we have the best propaganda campaign that money can buy.

"But we are bound to win—and we are going to win. For in this fight the people are with us."

It was in a 14-point indictment of Republicans in general that Mr. Truman said he has managed to find out where they stand on most major issues and that "they admire the government of the United States so much that they would like to buy it."

And on this list he had items like this:

"They approve of the American farmer—but they are willing to help him go broke.

"They stand four square for the American home—but not for housing.

"They are strong for labor—but they are stronger for restricting its rights.

"They favor a minimum wage—the smaller the minimum the better.

"They endorse educational opportunity for all—but they won't spend money for teachers of schools."

Over and over again, to use my own words but to express his thoughts, President Truman said: 'The Democratic party deserves your support because it has always accomplished the greatest good for the largest number of people.'

And the listening audiences believed the Man from Missouri.

Pounding away on this theme of 'fear of a change' seemed to raise the President's popularity with the people. He had always been a Chief Executive of ups and downs. When Franklin D. Roosevelt died Truman took over with an apparently united people behind him. Some fourteen months later his popularity experienced a severe nose dive, and by the time of the off-year elections of 1946 a low was reached. Only a few months later he strengthened himself by some bold moves, including a get-tough policy against Russia. Later that year the people backed away from him as he fought with the Congress. From then on it was difficult for Truman to receive popular support, if poll takers were to be believed. I think he realized that the *one way* he could win the November election would be to use the platform and radio in pounding home to the 'man on the street' and the woman in the kitchen the prosperity they had enjoyed for sixteen years under the national leadership of Roosevelt and Truman. Rural communities were the settings for hard hitting talks on what the Democratic party had done to increase the wealth of the farming population. Mine and factory districts were the locale for talks about the labor gains under the Democrats. He touched on

civil rights to a certain extent in many cities but reserved that explosive subject for a vast audience in the heart of Harlem. By and large, the President talked to his audiences—not over their heads. He discussed the problems they faced each working day.

Yes, the President really felt that he was carrying on a crusade. Over and over again his words were clothed in appeal and challenge. Citizens came to see a President—but my considered opinion is that they admired a man who 'spoke his mind' and told where he stood on every issue. The listeners didn't always approve of his slashing sentences of abuse and tirade. It is difficult to know now whether more lofty language would have been preferable. Perhaps the final result is the answer.

Public address continues a powerful force in molding American political opinion and action. Critics may hold otherwise, but this campaign proved again that public speaking, even by a Presidential candidate going through a transition period in his vocal technique, can bring successful results. The President, 'a country boy' at heart, possessed none of the pulse-tingling oratory of William Jennings Bryan, the classic content of Woodrow Wilson, or the 'my friends' appeal of his predecessor. He did combine in his campaign speech-making the elements of candor and courage. People appreciated these qualities —and their votes were dropped in the ballot box for the candidate who relentlessly campaigned in an endurance test of dawn-to-dark public speaking.

Truman spoke to his fellow-Americans in the most intensive platform activity the country has ever seen—either before or since radio came into popular use.

The result was victory!

THOMAS E. DEWEY

William A. Behl

THE campaign speaking of Thomas E. Dewey in the 1948 presidential race is a fascinating study in persuasion. In order to understand and evaluate his speaking and speeches, it is necessary to consider at least three factors: the audience to which he spoke or the general climate of opinion in America; his adaptation in the content, the composition, and the delivery of his speeches, to the prevailing attitudes of the people; and their reactions to his speaking and speeches.

I

The general conception of the presidential candidates was one of the most important factors in shaping Dewey's total campaign pattern. From the very outset he was, according to popular polls, in the White House seeking reelection, and President Harry S. Truman was on the outside seeking to get in.[1] This situation, not an unusual one in presidential elections, had considerable influence on Republican strategy, on the issues discussed in the campaign, and on the oratory of Thomas E. Dewey.

The predisposition in favor of Dewey led many pollsters to contend that the campaign oratory would be of little value from the point of view of changing votes. That was not to say, however, that the speaking campaign was not necessary. There were other reasons why it was necessary to wage a vigorous campaign. Not the least of these was the fact that the American people expect rounds of oratory in a presidential campaign. Then, Dewey had to hold the votes that were apparently pledged to him at the beginning of the contest. In addition, Dewey felt that he needed to help elect several Republican senators whose seats were being closely contested by Democratic candidates.

Another factor that influenced Republican strategy was the general feeling toward the incumbent administration. When Harry S. Truman took the oath as President of the United States, there was a widespread belief that he was not admirably suited for the job. Popular polls taken soon after he became President indicated that he would not serve the next full term of office.[2] President Truman made a gallant effort to measure up to his office. Again, polls indicated that he succeeded to some extent, but he held the confidence of the American people for only a short time.[3]

The attitude of labor toward the 80th Congress and the Republican party was a tremendously significant element in analyzing the speeches and speaking of Thomas E. Dewey. In general, labor union members believed that the Taft-Hartley law was unfair to labor and that it should be repealed. There was a strong feeling that, no matter what Governor Dewey or Governor Warren might say, the Republican party was anti-labor.

The prevalence of high prices was a significant factor in the 1948 presidential election. The housewife objected to the high prices she had to pay for food and clothing. The wage-earner was aware that increases in his income had not

WILLIAM A. BEHL *is Assistant Professor of Speech at Brooklyn College and and is a member of the* ASSOCIATION'S *Committee on Contemporary Public Address.* *In this article Mr. Behl concludes the analysis of Thomas E. Dewey's speaking which he began in the October 1948 issue.*

kept pace with the increases in commodity prices.

Still another factor that influenced the Dewey campaign oratory was the general air of disunity in our national government. There was dissension within the Democratic party. The formation of the Progressive party with Henry A. Wallace as its standard-bearer was evidence of that disunity and was certain to divert some votes from President Truman. Of course, a second split, the formation of the Dixiecrat party, was additional evidence that all was not well within the Democratic party.

Moreover, there was considerable friction between the executive and legislative branches of the federal government. President Truman charged that Congress was to blame; he called it, among other things, a 'do-nothing' Congress and directed caustic remarks at individual members. There was little doubt that Congress was to blame for some of the discord, but as Governor Dewey said: 'The tragic fact is that the administration was in the minority with his own party on some of the important measures before the 80th Congress.' Polls indicated that the people were not in accord with President Truman on this matter.[4]

Furthermore, some disunity was created on the home front by appeals to specific classes and groups of the electorate. In the handling of foreign affairs the change of policies, the change of personnel, and the confusion concerning the mission of specific individuals tended to give the impression of 'rifts within the lute.'

What was the status of Governor Dewey within his own party? If the Republican convention had been held in March 1948, Senator Vandenberg or Harold E. Stassen might have been nominated. As a matter of fact, on the eve of the convention there was considerable opinion that Dewey would have to give way to a compromise candidate. But his well-organized campaign and the prestige he had gained in the Oregon contest carried him through to a unanimous vote on the third ballot. It is significant to note that the final trend was started by a vote here and there from widely scattered states. The important factor is that Dewey won the nomination from strong candidates. It should also be remembered that the Republican party had never before renominated a candidate who had been defeated in a previous presidential election.

On the other hand, the nomination of Dewey over a strong field of Republican candidates put grave responsibilities on him. Harold E. Stassen was the favorite of the liberal wing, the young members of the Republican party. To the other extreme, Senator Robert A. Taft was the favorite of the conservative element; the elderly men of the party. Besides, there were several senators up for election or re-election who were not in complete accord with Dewey's philosophy of government. To wield these opposing elements into a united Republican party was a definite challenge to Nominee Dewey.

Another element that must be appreciated, if one is to understand the speaking and speeches of Thomas E. Dewey, was the general attitude of the American people toward communism and the USSR. There was general agreement that Russia had been a stumbling block to the solution of many of the postwar, international problems. Russia's stern and uncompromising attitude, where the United States was involved, was interpreted as a belligerent attitude toward America. Our attitude toward Russia was influenced by the uncovering of Russian spy rings on the North American continent during the war, and by the vigorous campaign to drive commun-

ists from the labor unions, from the motion picture industry, and from the federal government. The general American attitude toward the USSR and communism was not favorable.

2

I have outlined some of the more important attitudes of the American people during the presidential campaign, but the important part of this study is: How did Governor Dewey adapt to this general climate of opinion? There were many ways by which the Republican party and Candidate Dewey reconciled their policies and positions with the attitude of the people, but I am concerned, for the most part, with Dewey's adaptation through his speeches and speaking. His acceptance speech at Philadelphia set the general tone and stated the theme of his entire campaign. The central theme in this address was unity—spiritual as well as material. There was an air of confidence, not only in the composition of this address, but also in his manner of delivery. The address had the tone of a presidential candidate seeking re-election rather than one seeking election for the first time.

The issues that Governor Dewey discussed in his campaign may be divided into general and specific topics. He emphasized four general topics: 1. We must have unity in our domestic and foreign policies; 2. we must have competent men and women in government; 3. we must go forward, not backward; and, 4. we must keep communists out of the government. Some of his more important specific topics were: 1. a plan to alleviate inflation; 2. a program for the conservation of natural resources; 3. a specific farm program; 4. a program for labor; and 5. a plan for peace. The discussion of these general and specific topics was not always discrete, but for purposes of analysis it is convenient to make these divisions.

In view of the fact that there was considerable dissension in the administration of domestic and foreign affairs, it was not surprising that Dewey emphasized the need for unity at home and abroad. In all of his formal addresses and in most of his rear-platform speeches, he reiterated the thesis that unity was the 'backbone of our strength as a people.' Dewey's thesis was: Is this good for my country as a whole? His appeal for unity was a cliché, but, in the opinion of many, it had sufficient basis in fact to make it an important issue in the campaign.

The second general topic, that the Republicans could do the job better, was closely allied to the main theme of unity. This issue was based, to a considerable extent, on the thesis that in solidarity there is not only strength, but also proficiency. Again, however, there was sufficient evidence to make this topic an issue in the contest. There was some feeling that the President was not doing a good job, and it was believed that Governor Dewey was a good administrator.

The third general topic, that we must go forward, was based on the premise that in unity there is strength—that there is nothing the American people cannot do, if they are united. Of course, there was good reason why Dewey did not wish to look back—the past of his party was not a very pleasant or encouraging view. His appeal to go forward struck a responsive note with some people because it inspired confidence, and it appealed to the desire of the people to continue in the present period of apparent prosperity.

The fourth general topic, that we must keep communists out of the government, was received enthusiastically wherever Mr. Dewey spoke. He charged

that the Democratic administration was negligent in permitting so many communists to infiltrate into government positions, and that the present administration admitted this negligence when it appropriated a large sum of money to eradicate them. Governor Dewey maintained that the way to keep them out was not to appoint them. He also reiterated his pre-convention arguments that the Communist party should not be outlawed, that the individual communist should not be punished unless he violated the law, and that the way to defeat the communist was to keep him out in the open.

So much was said about the general issues which Governor Dewey discussed that most people forgot that he said anything about specific issues. He outlined his position and proposals on many important foreign and domestic problems. He set forth his views on reclamation, conservation, irrigation, and power development in his address at Denver, Colorado, and he reiterated those views in other major and minor speeches on his tour of the western states. He was careful to mention local projects in most of his speeches. At Denver, he pointed out that the 80th Congress appropriated three times as much as the 79th Congress, a Democratic Congress, for the Colorado-Big Thompson project. At Spokane, Washington, he emphasized the fact that the 80th Congress appropriated twice as much as the 79th Congress for the Columbia Basin project. The evidence tended to support his general theme of 'me too, but I can do it better.'

There was some connection between the issue of farm price support and the problem of conservation and reclamation. There were rumors that Dewey would abandon his farm price support program. He thought that he quieted these fears in his address at St. Paul, Minnesota, when he said: 'I am wholeheartedly and unequivocally for it . . . because it will benefit the farmer . . . and it is good for all of our people.'

It was generally conceded that Dewey would not receive many votes from labor, but he made a strong bid for its support in his address at Pittsburgh, when he criticized the present administration for threatening to draft railroad workers into the army in order to settle the railroad strike. He emphasized the point that the National Labor Relations Act of 1947 was the result of joint action of Democratic and Republican Congressmen alike. He spent considerable time defending the Taft-Hartley law. He pointed out that the fears set forth in President Truman's veto message never materialized. As a matter of fact, Dewey contended that during the year that the law was in force, strikes had decreased by one-half, that discharge rates in industry were down one-quarter, that jurisdictional disputes had decreased, and that communist influence in the unions had diminished. He admitted that the law was not perfect, but he said: 'Wherever and whenever it needs change, it will be changed.' He outlined a twelve point program which he said would not play 'selfish games with labor or with business or any other groups.' He promised to raise the minimum wage set by the present law, to extend coverage of the social security system and to increase its benefits, to make the Labor Department equal in cabinet status with Commerce and Agriculture, to strengthen collective bargaining, to bring an end to special interest legislation, to break the log jam in housing, to make sure that soaring prices do not steal food and clothing from the people, to remove the fears of a boom and bust cycle, to press forward in solving the problems of race relations, to expose communists, and to work for peace. Dewey made clear

that in the fulfillment of these promises he would be guided by one principle: 'Is this good for our country?'

Governor Dewey gave little attention to the problem of inflation during the presidential primary race. Most of his address in San Francisco, however, was concerned with the 'causes and cures' of inflation. He attributed the causes of inflation to the great expenditures during the war, to the tremendous European relief program, and to the policy of discouraging production which was advocated by the present administration. He outlined five proposals to cope with the problem: elect an administration of honest and able men and women; put the brakes on government spending; inaugurate a systematic reduction of the national debt; keep speculators in grain out of the national government; appoint men and women whose loyalty would be to our united people; and, support our system of free enterprise.

Governor Dewey probably intended to remain relatively silent on our foreign policy but the tenseness of our foreign relations forced him to state his policy. His address at Salt Lake City was concerned almost exclusively with our foreign policy. 'We must wage peace with all the vigor, imagination, skill and energy with which we waged war' was his general theme in this address. He outlined a nine-point program which differed from his present policy in only three essential respects: he urged the formation of a Federation of Europe; he asked for a two-ocean foreign policy that would include China; and he proposed a full partnership with our Latin-American neighbors in developing our material and spiritual resources. In many of his speeches, Dewey stressed the need for a consistent foreign policy —not one that 'is bobbing around like a cork on a stormy sea.' He never made specific mention of President Truman's plan to send Chief Justice Vinson to Moscow, but he charged on several occasions that 'we ought to let the right hand know what the left hand is doing in foreign affairs.'

Another very significant issue of the campaign, so far as Dewey was concerned, was the election of a sufficient number of Republican senators to keep control of the Senate. He confined his pleas, for the most part, to his rear-platform speeches, but in some of the doubtful states he made direct and specific entreaties in his major speeches. His support of some of the candidates put him in a paradoxical situation. For example, he urged the re-election of Senator Joseph H. Ball from Minnesota who had opposed him in the 1944 presidential election.

In view of the fact that, in general, Dewey thought that he was talking to an audience that had decided to vote for him, it was not surprising to find that emotional appeal was his strongest form of support. It is a fairly common practice among politicians to use complementary emotional appeals—appeals to the 'higher' motives and appeals to the 'baser' motives. Appeals to the 'baser' motives such as fear and prejudice are used to stir up feelings against men and issues; appeals to the 'higher' motives such as pride and patriotism are used to elicit a favorable response from an audience. Governor Dewey appealed to fear when he criticized the present administration for inefficiency and incompetence in both foreign and domestic affairs. But he appealed more frequently to the higher motives. His constant call for unity and for competent men and women in government were typical examples.

The content of Dewey's rear-platform speeches consisted, for the most part, of drives at pride, self-esteem, and patriotism. He praised the people for

their competence in handling local problems, for their resourcefulness, and for their ingenuity and integrity. He spoke of the beautiful scenery, the fertility of the soil; and he complimented the people for the fine quality of their grains and livestock. There was little doubt that Dewey was at his best with such appeals.

Dewey used logical support, for the most part, to refute the arguments of his opponents. In reply to the charge that the 80th Congress was a 'stingy' Congress in regard to conservation and reclamation, he compared the appropriations of the 80th Congress with those of the 79th Congress and said: 'I guess that settles that argument.' He did not use logical argument very much, but when he did it usually struck home with his immediate audience.

The divergence of opinion concerning the speaking personality of Mr. Dewey tended to prove that ethical persuasion was his weakest form of support. Many people felt that he was cold, formal, stiff, and unfriendly. One observer put it this way: 'Governor Dewey is not the typical American: he is big town.[5] On the other hand, there were many who felt that he became a very affable person. A news reporter who traveled with him on his campaign tour said: 'The trip helped to dispel the public concept that he is an aloof, cold personality.'[6] His ability as an efficient administrator was probably his strongest, personal attribute, even though his political opponents chided him about it.

Governor Dewey's manner of delivery was closely allied to the conception of Dewey—the man. One of his best attributes as a speaker was his orotund quality of voice—a quality that revealed confidence and authority—but was accentuated by mechanical amplification. I heard him speak, and I felt that neither was the pitch of his voice so low, nor was the orotund quality so full and resonant as they sounded over the radio. This mechanical anomaly is probably responsible, in part, for the impression that he is overconfident and pompous. In spite of this, however, Dewey was at his best before a microphone.

One of the Governor's best attributes as a radio speaker was his ability to create the impression of speaking extemporaneously while reading from his manuscript. He turned the pages of his text so unobtrusively that the audience was not aware of his reading. When he glanced at his manuscript, which he did infrequently, he did not break the continuity of his thought. Undoubtedly, his very careful use of pauses and his timely changes in pitch and force helped Mr. Dewey to develop an extempore style of reading a manuscript.

A study of wire recordings of his speeches which I made during the campaign revealed that he had difficulty in acquiring a conversational manner of speaking in his major addresses. On some occasions he seemed to be talking with the people, and on other occasions he appeared to be preoccupied with more serious problems than those he was discussing with his audience.

The impression that Dewey spoke with confidence was created as much by his physical activity as by his voice. Most of his physical activity was covert rather than overt: his gestures were never wide and sweeping; he was alive and alert; and his facial expressions were varied and expressive. His physical activity was that of a dignified and dynamic person speaking honestly and sincerely about causes he believed to be important.

The composition of the speeches was plain. There were few similes, metaphors, anecdotes, or catch-phrases that were remembered or repeated by those who heard him. The only words that news reporters could find to epitomize

the content of the speeches were unity, competence, and teamwork.[1] The oral style that was apparent in extempore utterances was not present in the composition of the formal addresses. The lack of a consistent, conversational style of delivery in the major addresses may have been due to the absence of an oral style of composition. The outstanding attribute of Dewey's speeches, in the opinion of many, was the absence of caustic and sarcastic remarks. Some critics wrote that Dewey would have been more impressive had he turned to the abundant use of the invective; but he opened his campaign on a high plane and so he kept it there.

3

The last, and probably the most important questions are: How did the people respond to the campaign oratory of Thomas E. Dewey? Did he achieve his objectives? It should be kept in mind that his primary objective was to hold those voters who had decided to vote for him before the campaign started. His secondary purposes were: to win as many independent votes as possible and to help elect Republican senators.

The greatest response, both positive and negative, was elicited by his constant appeals for unity, competence, confidence, and for his disdain of communism. His partisan audiences cheered wildly when he mentioned, by implication or otherwise, that we needed competent men and women in government; and when he asserted that communists should have no place in the national government, his hearers responded with thunderous applause. His constant call for unity did not always receive tremendous, overt response from the audience, but one sensed a quiet but definite acquiescence to his plea. Neither did his appeals for confidence always draw vigorous, overt reactions, but again, one sensed an attitude of approval and assurance. On the other hand, his adversaries contended that he was camouflaging the real issues in the campaign with glittering generalities and platitudes.

The reaction to his specific topics of labor, agriculture, and the like was definitely overshadowed by the disapproval of his general themes. Here again, of course, his partisans praised him, for the most part, for his stand on specific issues. But his opponents saw nothing but beautiful words and promises that could not be fulfilled. There was justification for this criticism, but as one observer put it: 'It is the privilege of a front-runner in a political campaign to speak in general terms.'[7] The same observer said: 'It is unwise to be specific about the future' in a political campaign for fear that circumstances beyond your control may prevent you from fulfilling your promises.

4

Did Governor Dewey achieve the objectives of his speaking campaign? If one may use the election returns as a criterion—the only pragmatic test available—the answer is very clear. The important question is: Why did the electorate reject the campaign oratory of Thomas E. Dewey? It is difficult to answer this question with any degree of certainty, but probably some of the important reasons are: 1. He appeared too confident; 2. he appeared too vague and indefinite in his discussion of general and specific topics; and 3. he did not appear to be 'the typical American, but big town.' If these conclusions may be accepted, they have significant implications for the teacher of speech.

[1] *Fortune*, Supplement, September 1948.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] *Fortune*.
[5] *Nations Business*, August 1948, 21.
[6] Leo Egan, *New York Times*, 3 October 1948.
[7] Joseph Alsop, *New York Herald-Tribune*, 4 August 1948, 19.

RADIO IN THE 1948 CAMPAIGN

Harrison B. Summers

SINCE 1932, radio has played an important part in every presidential campaign. Political organizations are very much aware of the fact that 95 per cent of the nation's homes are equipped with radio receiving sets, and that radio as a consequence offers the most effective method of reaching the great mass of the voters. The voter himself finds radio an important aid in the process of making a decision between the rival candidates. From news broadcasts and political commentaries on the radio no less than from stories in the daily newspaper, he is kept continually aware of 'the issues' of the campaign and of the contentions of the opposing parties. Even more important, broadcasts by the candidates themselves give the voter opportunity to form firsthand impressions of the candidates as individuals—as men whom he likes or whom he dislikes as persons. Probably broadcasts on the radio have greater effect on the outcome of a presidential election than all other factors combined.

1

In the 1948 election this seems to have been especially true. President Harry S. Truman's astonishing victory over his Republican rival could hardly be attributed to basic differences between the candidates on the so-called 'vital issues.' For the most part, both men advocated identical governmental policies—in the conduct of foreign affairs, in the providing of low-cost housing, in expanding the social security program, in providing legislation on civil rights, in continuing the farm price support program. Even in the vital area of labor legislation there was little real difference between the position taken by President Truman and that of Republican candidate Thomas E. Dewey.

Nor can the Truman victory have resulted from the influence of the daily newspaper or from the appearances of the candidates on the public platform. Hardly more than two-thirds of the nation's voters are regular readers of a daily newspaper; in any case, at least 75 per cent of the nation's daily newspapers openly advocated the cause of Governor Dewey. Both candidates made numerous speeches at political rallies or from the back platforms of their special campaign trains—but the voters who turned out for political rallies were men and women already strongly committed to the party which staged the affair, so 'personal appearances' by the candidates probably affected relatively few votes. Furthermore, the combined audiences attending the rallies addressed by either candidate or which were on hand for informal talks from the back platforms of presidential campaign trains totaled less than a million voters—and nearly forty-seven million votes were cast in the election in November.

On the other hand, millions of voters listened to the presentations of each of the candidates every time they were carried on the radio. A few of the political radio broadcasts probably attracted audiences of ten or fifteen million

HARRISON B. SUMMERS *is Professor of Speech in charge of courses in Radio in the Department of Speech at Ohio State University. From 1940 to 1942 he was Director of Public Service for the Eastern Division of the National Broadcasting Company. From 1942 to 1946 he was Manager of the Public Service Division of the American Broadcasting Company.*

listeners each; even an 'unimportant' speech by a candidate was heard by two or three million listeners, if that speech was broadcast over the radio. To be sure, most of those listeners were voters already disposed to favor the candidate who appeared on the program. But included in the millions who listened was a substantial minority composed of voters who had not yet come to a final decision, and even a few who favored the opposing candidate—but whose minds, perhaps, could be changed. Certainly the voting decisions of thousands of voters must have been made in the closing weeks of the campaign, and certainly, too, there were many who actually switched from support of one candidate to the other, if any dependence whatever is to be placed in the presidential preference polls which up to the last minute showed Governor Dewey well in the lead. There were no changes in the 'issues' in the final weeks of the campaign; what changes in voting preferences did take place must have resulted from the appeals of the candidates themselves, as carried to millions of voters over the radio.

2

A presidential campaign is not limited to the two or three months which immediately precede the day of the election. For practical purposes—and particularly from the standpoint of the way in which voters are influenced by radio—the campaign begins as early as the preceding winter, and consists of four distinct phases. First there is the phase which includes the several months before the nominating conventions—the phase in which individual candidates are making their individual drives for public support. The party nomination may be the immediate objective, but the campaigning carried on in February or March or April has a definite effect on the November election itself. Second, there are the party conventions, and the thoroughgoing radio coverage given the conventions by the four national networks. Probably nine voters out of ten listen to at least a part of the broadcasts coming from the convention of each major party, and are given either a favorable or an unfavorable impression of the party organization, the party leaders, and the party nominees by what they hear. Third, there is a 'period of quiet' following the close of the Democratic convention and continuing until the start of the formal campaign in September. The candidates are busy making plans for the final drive, and for five or six weeks, political activity is at a standstill, at least as far as actual campaigning on the radio is concerned. Finally, there is the 'campaign proper'—the intensive drive for votes that begins on Labor Day and continues until midnight of the day before the election.

Voters can be influenced, and their decisions expressed on election day definitely are influenced, by the impressions received in the pre-convention period and from broadcasts from the party conventions, no less than from the intensive campaigning that follows Labor Day. In fact, it is generally recognized that in 1940 and again in 1944, the outcome of the election had been decided not later than the early weeks of September. In view of the importance of radio in political campaigns, it is interesting to observe that the national networks make no charge for political time prior to the ending of the Democratic convention in July. On the contrary, they refuse entirely to *sell* time to either party in the pre-convention phase of the campaign. They do make time available to candidates for the party nominations, but wholly as a public service, reserving the right to decide which speeches are important enough to justify

a coast-to-coast broadcast. Similarly, the extensive coverage of the national conventions is provided by the networks without charge to the political parties, again as a public service. Coverage of the Republican and Democratic conventions in 1948 is estimated to have cost the four national networks not less than three million dollars in out-of-pocket expenses and in the loss of income from regular commercial programs which were cancelled because of the convention broadcasts. But once the conventions are ended political broadcasts are put on the air only on a paid basis with time for a coast-to coast broadcast ranging from $20,000 to $25,000 for a half-hour period.

During the 1948 campaign voters were given abundant opportunity to form their individual judgments of the various candidates for the presidency. From January through June practically every address delivered by a presidential candidate was carried on a coast-to coast radio hookup—of course, without cost to the candidate. In addition, most of the candidates took advantage of opportunities given them to present their views in special broadcasts from network studios or to appear as featured guests on such revealing programs as Mutual's 'Meet the Press' or Columbia's 'Presidential Timber.' In the period between January 1st and the opening of the Republican National Convention, candidates for the Republican, Democratic, Progressive, and Socialist party nominations were presented to the radio listening public in no less than seventy-three coast-to-coast network broadcasts —an average of three such broadcasts by presidential aspirants for each week in the period.

President Truman, as the nation's Chief Executive, fared best in the competition for free radio time. Not only his messages to Congress but no less than sixteen other speeches delivered by him between January and June were carried on national networks. Governor Dewey was heard less frequently in seven network appearances. Norman Thomas, perennial candidate of the Socialist party, and Henry A. Wallace, standard-bearer of the newly formed Progressive party, were heard in eight broadcasts each. The remaining thirty-one broadcasts featured Senator Robert Taft, Governor Harold A. Stassen, Governor Earl Warren, General Dwight D. Eisenhower —although an avowed non-candidate. General Eisenhower appeared on two coast-to-coast broadcasts—Senator Alben W. Barkley, and Senator Glen Taylor.

Not all of the broadcasts by candidates were political speeches, of course. Some were talks of a non-political nature, such as the addresses of Governor Stassen and Senator Taft before the *Philadelphia Bulletin* Forum. Others were appearances on regular network schedules—programs ranging from NBC's 'Chicago Round Table' to the same network's 'Living, 1948' or Columbia's 'Open Hearing.' But voters were able to form impressions of candidates in broadcasts of this nature no less than from broadcasts of actual political speeches. In fact, listeners could more accurately evaluate the abilities, the personality, and the temperament of a candidate on a program of the type of Mutual's 'Meet the Press' than from any formal speech presented by that candidate. And six of the major candidates for the presidential nomination were featured in broadcasts of 'Meet the Press' during the pre-convention period.

Next came the second phase of the campaign—the party nominating conventions themselves, presented in the completest possible detail in radio broadcasts for the edification and interest of radio listeners. Certainly voters must have been given some decided impres-

sions of the parties and of the candidates by the events reported from the two major party conventions. The harmony evidenced in the Republican convention was in striking contrast to the bitter antagonisms reported on the air when the Democrats assesmbled two weeks later. On the other hand, President Truman's 'fighting' speech of acceptance was probably far more appealing to the undecided voter than were the lofty platitudes which made up the Dewey offering to the Republicans.

Following the 'quiet period' in late July and August, the campaign went into its final and most active phase with the broadcast of President Truman's Labor Day address in Detroit. From that time on until the Monday evening before the election both major candidates made frequent appearances on the radio. Use of radio time, however, was less extensive than in the 1944 election. Following the adjournment of the Democratic National Convention, network time could be secured only on a strictly cash basis; with the Democrats having serious fund-raising difficulties and the Republicans considering the election as already won, total expenditures for network time for political broadcasts were only $1,202,000 in 1948, compared with $1,780,000 in 1944. Of the total, about 55 per cent represented expenditures by the Republican National Committee. The remainder included Democratic expenditures, costs of time used by Henry Wallace and the Progressive party, and the cost of several network broadcasts by the CIO and other labor groups supporting the Truman candidacy.

At least two or three new program technics were introduced during the campaign—new at least in the field of political broadcasting. The Progressive party made extensive use of 15-minute programs in which Mr. Wallace provided a running commentary in connection with musical selections, the music consisting chiefly of cowboy or 'hillbilly' numbers and Negro spirituals. The Democrats sponsored an afternoon program titled 'The Democratic Record Show'—largely music, with pointed political comments by an unidentified 'platter jockey.' A brief series sponsored by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union—or technically, by the 'political committee' associated with that organization—combined a brief talk by a Hollywood or Broadway star with an equally brief talk by a Democratic party leader and a short comedy routine in which the Republicans were the target of not-always-too-good-natured attack. In the final week of the campaign both Democrats and Republicans made use of a 'special events' announcer to give a 'color' description of what was taking place during the first two or three minutes prior to the broadcasts by the candidates from the monster political rallies in Madison Square Garden.

4

It is doubtful, however, whether the use of new political broadcasting techniques had any important effect on the outcome of the election. Radio's chief value in political campaigns is that it gives the listener a chance to become acquainted with and to judge the qualities of the candidate. No listener can listen to the broadcast speech of a candidate, or hear that candidate put 'on the spot' in a program of the type of Mutual's 'Meet the Press' without forming some sort of opinion of the candidate as a man—of the kind of person the candidate is. Sometimes the impression is favorable, and works to the candidate's advantage; sometimes things turn out the other way, and the listener has an unfavorable impression of the speaker. Particularly in an election in which both candidates seem to stand for vir-

tually the same principle it appears probable that the decisive factor is found in the personalities of the candidates, as those personalities are appraised by radio listeners.

As radio personalities how did the two major candidates compare? More accurately, how did they compare during various stages of the campaign? If it can be assumed that presidential preference polls afford a reasonably accurate measure of the attitudes of voters toward the candidates at a given time—though not necessarily a dependable index to the way the same voters may cast their votes on election day—the first phase of the 1948 campaign saw President Truman steadily declining in the esteem of the public, with Governor Dewey making consistent gains. No change was evidenced in their relative position during the convention period, or the 'quiet' phase of the campaign which followed. But judging from the outcome of the election, President Truman made an effective comeback during the final weeks of the campaign, and far surpassed his opponent in the strength of his appeal to voters.

How do these changes in voters' preferences compare with the radio personalities of the candidates at different periods of the campaign? When the 1948 campaign opened President Truman was anything but an attractive microphone personality. In most of the sixteen speeches carried on networks before the first of June his presentation was colorless and uncertain; he stumbled over words, lost his place in his manuscript, and allowed the flow of ideas to be broken by awkard pauses. To the radio listener it was clear that Mr. Truman was reading a manuscript, not talking to people—and there was often reason to suspect that the manuscript was one he had not even glanced over prior to the broadcast.

Governor Dewey also had his shortcomings at the microphone, but they were shortcomings of quite a different character. He showed abundant self-confidence; his tones were well-rounded, his diction well-nigh perfect. But the very perfection of his delivery was a handicap; it lacked vigor and 'folksiness' and human qualities. Even so, the Dewey style in the spring of 1948 made a more favorable impression on listeners than the fumbling Truman mannerisms of the same period. Especially was this true in Governor Dewey's broadcast debate with Governor Harold E. Stassen. Under the stress of a competitive situation Governor Dewey lost the somewhat 'stuffy' style which characterized the earlier speeches in his campaign; his language was simple, direct and vigorous, and he gave his radio listeners a consciousness not only of his skill as a debater, but also of his strong conviction of the essential rightness of his cause. The debate with Stassen was the climax of the Dewey pre-convention campaign; in view of the contrast between the microphone style shown in that debate and the halting radio style of President Truman, it is not surprising that in the late months of the spring, voters showed a strong preference for Governor Dewey with a corresponding slump in the popularity rating of President Truman.

But in the final phase of the campaign, the situation was partially, if not completely reversed. Governor Dewey's microphone personality was more effective than it had been in the early months of the spring; he showed more 'warmth,' more vigor and more sincerity in his speeches, and he sounded more at ease before the microphone. From a vote-making standpoint, however, his speeches were still a bit too close to perfection. They were beautifully phrased, carefully constructed, presented with studied pre-

cision; but they lacked both the 'down-to-earth' quality that was to characterize the talks of his opponent and the evidences of overwhelming conviction. Even so, the Dewey personality on the radio in October was considerably more effective than the Dewey personality in March, and far more appealing than the fumbling, stumbling microphone style of President Truman in the January-to-June phase of the campaign. Against that earlier Truman personality Governor Dewey probably would have won the election in a walk.

But between May and October the Truman who was brought to the radio listening public had undergone a tremendous change. First evidences of the change came early in June on the President's 'non-political' tour of the West. In his speeches on that trip President Truman talked from notes instead of from a manuscript, and for the first time during the campaign, really talked *to* his listeners—and talked with every evidence of purpose and sincerity. The change was even more apparent in the 'fighting' speech of acceptance which Mr. Truman gave at the Democratic National Convention. But the 'new look' in the Truman radio personality reached its zenith in the broadcast speeches made by the President in October—and probably never before in history has a man in public life made such strides forward in speaking effectiveness in a period of less than six months.

The Truman of October, as he was heard out of the nation's loudspeakers, was easy and assured before his audiences. The fumbling and uncertainty of his pre-convention appearances had disappeared; so had the impression that what he said was being read, and not too well read, from a manuscript. He had acquired a good sense of timing and of emphasis. His speeches were lacking in polish; at times they seemed poorly constructed and uneven in quality—quite possibly, the lack of polish was deliberate. But the major strength of President Truman's style at the microphone rested in his informality, his 'me to you' directness, and a homey, down-to-earth quality that was entirely lacking in the Dewey presentations.

To be sure, there were elements in the Truman personality that could not have been attractive to all of his radio listeners. Certainly he lacked the dignity ordinarily expected of the Chief Executive of the United States. Even his supporters were sometimes appalled at the bitterness of his attacks on his opponent and his opponent's party, at the waspishness of his tone, and at the snarling anger in his voice. Probably these characteristics of his October radio personality lowered the respect in which he was held by listeners; possibly with portions of his audience, however, these same characteristics won greater support for his cause. One fact is certain: in September and October President Truman came before his radio listeners as a fighting candidate: an underdog, doomed to certain defeat, but one who refused to accept defeat without a fight. Certainly that side of his personality won the admiration of radio listeners whether they approved of his methods or not.

5

Summed up, Candidate Truman was able, in five short months, to change almost completely the impression he made on voters as they listened on the radio—to change the impression from one of colorless, fumbling uncertainty to one of friendly confidence and vigorous attack. Candidate Dewey, over the same period, showed improvement in microphone personality, but not enough improvement—he remained to the end a

candidate who was polished and capable, but who lacked the ability to get 'out of the clouds' and to talk to the voter on his own level.

Perhaps the basic differences in the personalities of the two candidates provide the explanation of the stunning Truman victory in the 1948 election. Issues may have been important, but the American public made its selection in large measure on the qualities of the man—qualities that were evident in the appearances of the candidates on the radio. Radio's greatest contribution to the 1948 campaign, as to any political campaign, was the opportunity it gave to millions of voters to form their judgments of the candidates' personalities at firsthand. The majority cast their votes for the man who most successfully aroused their admiration, their confidence, and their respect.

OUR SPEECH AND OUR INTER-PERSONAL RELATIONS

Frank M. Rarig

ARISTOTLE somewhere defines the soul as that energy within the individual which causes him to strive toward the unification of his impulses to the end that he may attain inner harmony. When I yielded to the impulse to accept the invitation of President Black to speak to you today and then, on impulse, selected the subject our chairman has announced I let myself in for a prolonged period of *dis*harmony. To undertake a public speech on inter-personal relations is to launch a paradoxical enterprise. The inter-personal relations of any one individual comprise a pattern of particulars peculiar to him alone, whereas when one makes a public speech he is assumed to discover to his audience the means of persuasion in his subject by establishing the lowest common denominator of their common interests. May I suggest that in the present plight of the public world it is urgently incumbent on every person to give careful thought to the maintenance of the integrity of his inter-personal relations, his freedom of association with other human beings? Once we recognize the multifarious diversities of these relations and associations we confront an issue. Shall we confine our inter-personal relations to those who hold our political or religious beliefs, who subscribe to our economic notions, who by biological inheritance belong to our segment of the human race; or shall we make it our practice to accord to every other human being his own identity and in the spirit of William James as an 'experimental believer' seek, not to tolerate but to appreciate, the mode of experience of others? Years ago Lord Dunsany wrote a poem, entitled On the Death of a Moslem Friend, in which he said that after he had entered the Christian heaven he would find the back door that opened on the weed-grown path leading to the Moslem heaven and there sit with his friend and 'tell old tales again.'

One obstacle in the way of such a practice of inter-personal relations is the craving for what the sociologists call *status*, for economic, social, and cultural recognition and distinction. In whatever competitive situation the person of dominating temperament is placed he seeks to invent ways and means of putting himself on top. Frequently in social groups may be observed the aggressively garrulous talker who snatches the conversation from the less aggressive members. The older child in a family sometimes looks upon later arrivals as upstarts over whom he must maintain his dominance. In the annals of community gossip there circulates many a tale of husbands, on the one hand, and of wives, on the other, who lord it over their mates. Some of these failures in conjugal reciprocity adorn the records of the divorce courts. Robert Frost's West Running Brook is a study in matrimonial dialectic which ends in a synthesis, or consensus, through the interpenetration of the mood of each into that of the other. His Mending Wall has the opposite outcome. The 'neighbor beyond the hill' barricades himself behind his inherited dogma: 'Good fences make good neighbors.' He

FRANK M. RARIG *has recently retired as Chairman of the Department of Speech at the University of Minnesota. He is at present teaching at the University of Missouri.* *This address was given at the meeting of the Central States Speech Association at Chicago in April 1948.*

will not admit the paradox of reason and springtime custom.

It must be admitted that in any all-inclusive sense we are all denied, or deny ourselves, complete freedom of association. In any consideration of human relations we must make numerous allowances for individual differences. Each must work out his own philosophy and practice of relationships with his fellows. The basic habits, attitudes, and predispositions of the thinker have been established before the acquisition of language made possible the formulation of a philosophy. General philosophers who undertake to explain the universe and man's relation to it have been sorted into three classes: first, those who read books and try to extract from them a philosophy of life; second, those who read the philosophers, teach philosophy, and write textbooks about philosophy. They are the professors of philosophy. The third class are the thinkers who make a philosophy out of their own experience. They are the true philosophers. Every man, whatever his range of ideas and skill in language, is his own philosopher unless he has so stuffed himself with books as to lose whatever potential power of thought he may have had. Bacon tells us that 'Reading maketh a full man.' 'Yes,' answers Quiller-Couch, 'and too much of it makes him too full.' At the other end of the scale is the man about whom Hazlitt complained that he had written more than he had read.

Someone has said that every human being who has reached the age of twenty years has had enough basic experience to last him the rest of his life. If he is wise, he will make it one of his interests in his succeeding years to explore and understand those early experiences. Willa Cather once said that every story she wrote had as its theme something she had felt as a child. The creative artist has a means whereby he can infect others with a specific quality of emotion and enliven a recognition of experiences similar to his own; he can uncover hidden springs and cause to flow afresh the secret waters of life. But the philosophers, who, as Quiller-Couch says, 'try to comprehend the universe' end by breaking their jugs and spilling the contents. When one who lacks the vision of a poet and who is at best an amateur in philosophy attempts to extract from his own experience a sketch of what he thinks he may have learned about the problem posed by my topic he incurs a terrifying risk of making a public exhibition of what ought to be kept private.

By way of indirection, let me tell you of the case of a former president of the University of Minnesota. President X spent his childhood and youth on a farm in Indiana. The soil was poor. His parents were poor. They accepted the theological economics of John Calvin. God prospers the righteous man. The poor are poor because they or their fathers to the third and fourth generation have committed a sin. On the other hand, the banker on whom the family sometimes depended for survival was rich. He stood in well with God while the poor farmers labored in their poverty under the burden of His condemnation. President X had committed himself to address a convention of bankers. As the day approached he became more and more nervous. 'When the chairman called on me,' he said, 'I was just able to stand up. I opened my mouth, but no words came. My larynx kept climbing up into my mouth, and I kept trying to swallow it. All my feelings of inferiority in the presence of our small-town banker in Indiana took possession of me. I kept working my jaw and lips, and wishing I could sink through the floor. After a

while I heard a voice and concluded it must be mine.'

President X told me this story in a private conversation. So far as I know, he never told it in public. As a public speaker he was handicapped by a deficiency of oratorical afflatus. He was a modest man.

I, too, was born on a farm, a farm in Kansas. My father was not rated a poor man. We, too, were indoctrinated with the theological economics of John Calvin, but the poor farmers up in the hills were the ones who had sinned. The fact that some of the farmers on the rich bottom lands of the Solomon River Valley never went near a church was glossed over. Our physical environment was the earth and sky, work animals and farm machinery, corn, wheat, hogs, and cattle. Our fate was hidden in the uncertain vagaries of the weather. A field of corn would stand one day in full bloom, with promise of sixty bushels to the acre. The night would turn hot and still. The next morning there would come a few puffs of hot air from the south. These puffs would steady into a hot wind that scorched the tassels, scalded the blades of the corn, and turned the promise of yesterday into a ghostly memory. Or heat and moisture together would breed the black rust and in a few hours turn hundreds of acres of wheat into worthless straw that had to be cleared from the land. In the meantime, our lives had been predestined by the ever-present mortgage that had to be paid off, or all would be lost. Years later I learned that we, with millions of other farmers, were mining the fertility of the soil to produce cheap food for the industrial workers of Britain and western Europe, workers in industries which, besides producing goods for the rest of the world, produced also the present surplus populations of those countries.

We went to school in the town two miles away. Our mother was determined that no son of hers would be a farmer if she could prevent it. But in the summer it was work, work, work, early and late. A holiday on the Fourth of July was a rarity, never conceded unless the wheat harvest was finished. One of our recreations was reading. We devoured the stories of Hamlin Garland in whose portrayals of farm life we recognized in sharpened outlines our own pattern of life. An alleviating fact was the entertainment out by the barn on summer evenings. Itinerant workers, unattached men from farther west, 'Arkansas travellers,' migrants from Tennessee and Georgia, an occasional college graduate who had 'gone back to the blanket' would stage wrestling matches and boxing bouts. An ex-cowpuncher would sing an interminable ballad to the twanging of a guitar. Old Jerry Swan, a former slave, might be persuaded to take off his shirt and tell the story of the scars across his back and arms where his master, after making him choose between a thrashing and being shot, had lashed him. Or his son Bill, a giant Negro, would tell his story of the devil who, let loose out of hell every seven years, would come to earth, clanking his chains behind him, in search of victims for his everlasting bonfire. I can still hear Bill's snarl as he reached the climax of satanic rage and of his own terror when in the nick of time he slammed his door in the devil's face. Bill could neither read nor write, but he had a true artist's flair for an audience.

In spite of our hard work to gain material things we were given to understand that life on earth had as its main purpose our preparation for a life of eternal bliss in the hereafter. In spite of our best efforts, however, we might fail of that blessed state, for over us hung the ominous cloud of Calvinistic predestination. To stand a chance of salvation we must

avoid the evils of this world. Moral precepts were sternly Puritanical. 'Learn to say no' was an oft-repeated formula. 'You were conceived in sin and born in wickedness' was another reminder of our plight. At age sixteen, Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter* plunged me into the slough of despond. I was psychically underdistanced. Years later my re-reading of Hawthorne led me to reconstruct my earlier interpretation. It was not Arthur Dimmesdale's sin but his lack of integrity and strength of character that destroyed him. On the other hand, it was Hester Prynne's honesty and courage that enabled her to rise above shame and proudly wear the scarlet letter.

Although these early years of my initiation into life have been sketched in somewhat sombre hues, though all pleasures seemed suspect, our ebullient energies would not be denied. My brothers and I swam in summer, skated in winter, hunted, played football, tried to emulate the fistic prowess of John L. Sullivan and Jake Kilraine, dreamed of winning glory as athletes, found and treasured Indian arrowheads, learned the names of birds and trees, in spring and autumn marked the flights of ducks and thrilled to the honking of wild geese in the sky. At night we gazed at the planets and the stars, felt exalted and lifted up until we gave way to fantasies of flight through interstellar space, wondered about God and the mystery of life.

An interpreter of the psychology of Alfred Adler has said of memory: 'It is easy to see that the earliest impressions must have naturally the most purely emotional strength. . . . The book of memory is not like a book with successive leaves, so much as a single tablet over which the first impressions are scrawled in a large and simple style, and the succeeding ones have to be written around them, till it is overwritten again and again in smaller and smaller characters.'[1] These words suggest that in childhood and youth we acquire the raw materials of our adult psychic life, which are modified in varying degrees as we add experience and habits of discrimination. We do not consciously recall most of these early 'memories,' but nevertheless as 'physiological memories,' they largely predetermine for most individuals the emotional *tone*, as Adler says, of their aversion from or inclination to certain actions.[2] The early acceptance of an exclusive family tradition may circumscribe an adult's social adaptability. A Southerner complained to his companion in a northern Minnesota hunting lodge: 'How do you know what to talk about with these guides, fishermen, and farmers? You talk to everybody. I'm lost here.' Social exclusiveness may combine with professional training to limit one's human relations. A state university president was intolerant of commonplaces in conversation. He turned his back on farmer legislators who mentioned crops or the weather. His budget was cut. A professional educator assumed a severely professional role with his colleagues at the luncheon table. One of them, himself a mathematician, remarked: 'I'll not eat lunch with him again. His normal curves and statistical averages interfere with my digestion.' Bagehot says that Guizot was *cast*, not made. Beyond a certain stage in his life, he heard nothing, saw nothing, learned nothing of the life about him. On the other hand, says Bagehot, Shakespeare had an 'experiencing nature.' He brings to life even the dull man's speech. He could doubtless have made the speech of the old prospector, of whom Stewart Edward White said that his conversation assayed one low grade idea per thousand words. Both Scott and Shakespeare talked with all classes and ranks of men.[3]

At the cultural level, beliefs often immunize the mind against the impact of

direct experience. Robbie, in Monica Stirling's story *The Prisoner,* had been told by his father that the noblest thing in life was to be a free man. Robbie believed he was free, but the fact was that he was a mere automaton in the routine of his job. With no power of self-direction, he practiced the conventional vices of others. Told when he enlisted in the army that the most terrible thing that could happen to him was to be taken prisoner, he found himself after a fight in North Africa surrounded by 'operatic-eyed Italians' who treated him with the courtesy due a guest. He could not believe that he was a prisoner until he found himself in a prison camp.

One of the main purposes of courses in the humanities is to acquaint students with the cultural influences that have given them their beliefs. One of my classes came to confront this problem in the following way. A speaker at convocation had said that four great historical movements—the Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation, the Industrial Revolution, and the French Revolution—have determined, for the most part, what we in the Western World think and how we feel. During a discussion of the lecture, a young man asked: 'What did he mean by that statement? I want it understood that I do my own thinking. No historical movement has determined my thinking for me.' 'We can soon test that,' I said, 'by what happened in my Extension class last week.'

A young woman had made a speech on 'Our Great Ideals.' After lamenting the debunking of our ideals of Washington, Franklin, and Lincoln by recent biographers, she had said: 'But we still have some great ideals, and one of them is the ideal of freedom from the power of the Pope to tell us what we must think.' When the stir had quieted, I asked: 'How many of you in this class think this is one of our great ideals?' A dozen or more hands went up. 'How many of you do *not* think it is one of our great ideals?' Another dozen hands went up. In front seats sat four Jewish girls. 'Why don't you raise your hands to either question.' A pretty dental hygienist, with a toss of her head, replied: 'Our tradition is older than either of theirs.'

'Now, Mr. Independent Thinker, what is your tradition?'

'Lutheran.'

'If the Protestant Reformation had never taken place, what would you be?'

And with a look of stupefaction, he ejaculated: 'A Catholic!'

In how large a segment of his physical association with others this young man's beliefs isolated him from his fellows we can only guess. How many members of these three groups in the intervening twenty years have shared community of experience with members of the other two? Any belief rigidly held may bar him who holds it from the human community. Verbal adherence to a negative morality likewise denies the creative social impulse and leads to inner conflicts which, if not resolved, continue to harass the multiple selves inhabiting the same psychic dwelling.

The logic of such social illogic, as it may affect others, was illustrated at a conference of theologians at Swanwick in England. Said Reinhold Niebuhr: 'We cannot perform any act, however lofty our motive, without having in it some element of self-sin.' The late William Temple, Archbishop of York, replied with a limerick:

> At Swanwick, when Niebuhr had quit it,
> Said a young man: "At last I have hit it;
> Since I cannot do right,
> I must find out tonight
> The best sin to commit and commit it."

Teachers, as well as theologians, need a sense of humor to mitigate their authority. An educational expert has said that teachers after sixty become increasingly

irritable and intolerant of their students' deficiencies. For some of us, this expert has put his finger on a sensitive spot. A teacher's difficulty in recognizing the stage of development of the individual student increases with advancing years. Most teachers, whatever their age, are subject to periodic shocks on discovering the gaps between their instruction and their students' understanding. Some take these revelations with resentment. A dean in a Middle Western university had learned better:

> John appeared at the first three meetings of my classes and did not show up again until the final examination. I thought to myself: "There is that fellow John; he is not entitled to take this examination, but I'll let him take it and get the flunk he deserves." To my astonishment, he handed in the best examination paper I got, and I had to give him a grade of 94. A few days later, meeting John in the hall, I said: "Come in the office, John; I want to ask you a question. How does it happen that after attending my class only three times you wrote the best examination paper I got? I had to give you a grade of 94." "Well, Prof," said John, "I'm sorry I didn't do any better. I thought I had your course figured out to make a hundred, but I made one mistake. I heard you lecture three times, and you got me a little confused."

No homily on inter-personal relations would be at all balanced unless it contained a caution. There are persons to whom we are allergic and who are allergic themselves. Charles Lamb sometimes made no bones about declaring his antipathies. Once at a reception, he asked a friend: 'Who is that man over there?' 'Why,' replied his friend, 'that is Mr. So-and-so. Don't you know him?' 'No,' replied Lamb, 'I don't know him, and I don't want to know him. I hate him.' 'By all means, let me introduce you to him. If you know him, you will like him.' 'Then I don't want to know him,' said Lamb; 'I want to hate him.' Readers of Lamb will recognize this as an instance of his habit of blurting out what he felt at the moment.

On the other hand, Thomas Mann, years ago in an essay entitled This Man Is My Brother, described the inhuman atrocities perpetrated by Hitler and then said, in effect: 'As a man, I detest and utterly abhor what this man has done; but as an artist I must not pass judgment on him; for from the moment I pass judgment on him, I cannot hope to understand him as a human being.' This is the creed of the artist. It may, in some measure, be the creed also of all who would practice the art of living with others.

[1] Phillipe Mairet, *A.B.C. of Adler's Psychology* (London, 1928) 15, 16.
[2] Ibid. 16.
[3] Walter Bagehot, Shakespeare—The Man, *Literary Studies*, (New York, 1898), vol. 1.

THESE TRUTHS WE HOLD SELF-EVIDENT

Robert D. Clark

IN this post-war period when institutions from East to West have been or now are in the process of curriculum evaluation and change, speech has come in for a good deal of criticism. Among the critics we ourselves have been the most outspoken. 'The Modern Teacher of Speech Is Obsolete,' declares the title of the lead article in a recent issue of our own official publication, THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH.[1] Not long ago I heard a speech teacher say that he had been called in to appraise the liberal character of the speech department in another institution. After careful study of the curriculum he had been forced to report that it was not liberal; that it was almost exclusively professional in character; that it had, in his judgment, no real place in the liberal arts college. We are our own severest critics.

I

In these times we can afford to be critical of ourselves. We know, for one thing, that every other department is under fire even as we are, that all of us must re-evaluate our offerings. We are confident also of our strength—not, I hope, merely boastful but confident of the worth of our offerings and of the contribution which we make to our students.

The criticism has not given us so much concern as the damning silence and the faint praise of some of the non-speech people. When a great university president and chancellor, highly skilled in the art of rhetoric, uses his skill to advance his concept of a liberal curriculum but finds in it no place for rhetoric, we are offended. When a great eastern university, in listing the 'traits of mind' essential to the liberally educated, names 'to communicate thought' but finds in its curriculum no place for speech we are distressed. It was these conditions of neglect that called forth in 1946 from the president of our ASSOCIATION a critical analysis and a summation that 'Basically the weakness of Mr. Hutchins' grand scheme and of the latter part of the Harvard Report is that they rest tacitly on the assumption that knowledge is power.' Said W. N. Brigance in his analysis, 'Having knowledge is not enough. There must be added ability to *use* that knowledge.'[2]

Certainly as teachers of speech we heartily approve of Mr. Brigance's evaluations, and we fully recognize the importance of speech as a medium for the use of knowledge. But, so far as I can determine, our colleagues do not quarrel with us over the assertion that there must be 'added ability to *use* that knowledge.' The question with them is this: Is speech training in the curriculum a satisfactory vehicle in helping the student to improve his ability to use his knowledge—not merely to use it—but to use it with an understanding of its social as well as its individual implications?

The criticism of those who doubt that we can help the student to use his knowledge is not transient. From Plato to modern times speech training has been subject to adverse criticism. We are so close to our subject, we become so engrossed in the immediate results which we achieve—the awkward, timid boy who gains sudden confidence and efficiency;

ROBERT D. CLARK *is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Oregon.* *This article is based upon his address as president of the Western Speech Association at the SAA convention in Salt Lake City in December 1947.*

the loud, aggressive girl who develops poise and charm—we are so frequently rewarded by gratifying results that we give our attention ever to refining the process of getting immediate results—of getting them more quickly, more efficiently, and on a higher level of skill. It seems as simple as that: there are certain results to be achieved, and we must find the ways and the means to achieve them. Our task, as one speech educator expressed it a few years ago, is simply to teach students how to 'unload.'

And so we hold self-evident these truths that the purpose of training in speech is to make more effective speakers: it is to teach people how to use the skills of communication, to win a response, to persuade, to interest, to convince; it is to help the student achieve personality adjustment, to make him more expressive, to teach him to interpret the printed page so that he will 'charm, enlighten, and stimulate the audience by the vital expression of thought and emotion.'

But I believe that these typical statements of goals, far from being self-evident truths, are partial; that they are unnecessarily circumscribed; that they are based upon a faulty concept of 'truth' and as stated are socially dangerous in a democratic society; and that in this statement of goals may lie one of the reasons for denying to speech its rightful evaluation in the liberal arts curriculum. When we misstate or understate our goals we fall short of realizing our responsibility.

Let me take as an illustration my own field of public address. When we say that one of the general purposes of speech training in the schools is to teach students how to persuade, we do not really mean it. Such a statement of aim is *partial;* it is removed from the social context, and so removed has a doubtful place in the school and college curriculum. Let me illustrate. William James in one of his lectures on pragmatism explains purpose (in a somewhat different connection) by reference to a football game. The 'aim' of a football team, he says, is 'not merely to get the ball to a certain goal (if that were so, they would simply get up on some dark night and place it there), but to get it there by a fixed *machinery of conditions*—the game's rules and the opposing players.'[3] The purpose of speech training is not simply to develop skill in persuasion but to develop those skills which may be used under certain conditions; namely, within a social context.

Let me illustrate again. A recent issue of a national weekly magazine carries the story of a United States congressman who built his success by 'chilling the spines' of crossroads folk with 'tales of horrible crimes' which he witnessed when he was an exchange student in Russia.[4] Now this same congressman, to be sure, had never been in Russia as an examination of passport records later disclosed, but when this fakery was revealed during the campaign he merely screamed 'Red' all the louder and was elected by a handsome majority. He himself had been for many years a teacher of speech and had learned well the lessons of persuasion which he used to make of himself, as he said, an 'oratorical hatchet man.' If persuasion is one of the ends for which we train people in speech then this man was successfully trained.

I cite this example not as typical but as illustrative of the absurd implication which lies in the assumption that persuasion *per se* is a satisfactory statement of goal for speech training.

I hasten to add that I do not object to persuasion when it is thought of not as an end but as an essential tool of democracy. Nor must you think that I am voicing a general objection to an emotional appeal. Some of the great values of life man can approach only through his emotions. In this particular appeal

the office of oratory can approach that of poetry.

Wherein lies the force of the objection to the statement of persuasion as a 'general end'? It is this: once we state such a goal, we immediately begin to seek the means of achieving it; and having omitted the social context in the statement of the goal, we ignore it also in the treatment of means.

Persuasion becomes an instrument of individual power. We put our emphasis —generally unintentionally—upon the means as a source of self-aggrandizement. We turn to psychology for a dissection of the human heart and mind. We learn the lessons of motivation, we learn to name and number the springs of human action, and we see a certain spirit of cunning come over those whom we teach. If you are to persuade, we say to the student, appeal to a man's love of property, to his desire for power, to his tender regard for his loved ones. And to prove the efficacy of our principles we cite examples from the advertiser. He knows how to get results: his formula is to create in the public a state of anxiety, a state of unrest and agitation which can be resolved only by the purchase of Forsodent's toothpaste or Duarf Remedy (*Fraud*—spelled backwards).

Once we have set our goal, 'to persuade,' we organize our textbooks, chapters, and materials for the achievement of that particular goal. All of the technics of composition and delivery known to us we assemble around this one purpose—to persuade; we exhibit to the student the value of imaginative speaking, of appeal to the senses, because we know that if he can catch in words the subtle aroma of rose petals, the sizzle and smell of frying bacon, the sharp sting of a December wind, and if he can weave these into the magic of words he can increase his personal power, he can do a better job of persuasion. We teach him to use the 'yes-yes' technique, to get people into the habit of agreeing so that later on at the point of natural resistance they will have ceased to be critical; we teach him to use stereotypes so that people's thinking can be channelled more quickly and efficiently; we even advise him that personal character, goodness, and ethical status are important because they will help him to persuade.

Let me say again that I recognize the very great importance of persuasion in a democratic society—not only to assist the public in the realization of values but to protect it from the exploitation of demagogues. I am only asking the question: Is our purpose in teaching speech simply to put the ball over the goal; is it simply to persuade, to gain personal power, or is it to persuade within a social context, a 'machinery of conditions'? The answer to that question will determine, I believe, whether or not we as teachers of speaking have a rightful place in the general education in the schools and in the liberal arts program in the colleges.

We might illustrate with equal effect from others of our stated goals, as for example 'personality adjustment' or techniques in interpretation and drama. We could with profit explore the reasons for our narrow emphasis. I believe that it is essential that we attempt to determine why we have placed the narrow, individualized emphasis upon our speech training. Only through such an understanding can we approach a proper course of action.

2

Let us note some of the reasons why we are prone to pursue very limited objectives.

1. One of the causes that is emphasized by those who have been writing in criticism of speech offerings is the overspecialization which characterizes our academic age. The tendency is, as a soc-

iology professor writing in *Western Speech* said, to stake out claims and prosecute the trespassers.[5] Fearing to trespass on the subject-matter territory of our colleagues we deal with skills in a very narrow context.

2. Another cause arises from the fact that speech has long needed and is presently seeking a scientific approach to some of its problems. Those who knew Charles H. Woolbert or those of us who have read his publications know well his disdain for guesswork and his triumphant cry when he discovered laboratory techniques for the testing of some of the methods of teaching. We shall always need to approach certain of our problems scientifically if we are to avoid inefficiency, and even quackery. But too close attention to the science of speech may cause us to place our emphasis upon the most easily measured aspects of our discipline and so give us a partial view.

3. Perhaps a more basic cause is that speech is essentially a tool. We use it to get results. The consequence is that when we place it in the academic discipline we are prone to regard it simply as a tool, to take toward it the view of the 'technician,' and to have little regard for its social and moral dimensions. This is an old problem in the field of teaching speech.

4. In our own age this tendency of oratory to seek the immediate result without regard to the larger consequences has a particularly congenial climate. In America our extreme individualism is exemplified in the prodigal waste of our natural resources and in the stockwatering stratagems of our heroes of the gilded age. This individualism has called for the tools of power, and high among them is persuasion. And strangely enough philosophy has seemed to bless this ungovernable individualism both by its doctrine of survival of the fittest and its pragmatic concept of truth. If an individual is to survive and, almost equally important, if he is to be successful, he must have power; persuasion gives him success and power; ergo, we must teach him to be persuasive. Under these circumstances truth is that which works. Truth for the orator is that which gets results, that which persuades. We define results narrowly. What is truth for one may not be so for the other. What is truth for the salesman may be pretty hard on the consumer. But we must be tough-minded, not softhearted sentimentalists. Let the public look out for itself. I cannot overemphasize the pervasiveness of this point of view.

One of the weaknesses of pragmatism, to judge it by its own standards, is this very fact that men seem to define that which 'works' on an individual basis—this is good because it works for me; it gets results.[6] However, both James and Dewey conceive of pragmatic truth as that which works for the welfare of the group and not simply that of the individual as antagonistic to the group. It is extremely important for us to understand this concept if we are to regard ourselves as 'practical men.' In limiting our goals we follow the practical philosophy of James and Dewey but follow afar.

3

Albert Einstein has said: 'Perfection of means and confusion of aims seem to characterize our age.'[7] They not only characterize our age but much of our thinking about speech. In our attempt to adjust on the one hand to our own immediate past history of elocutionism and on the other hand to the specialization of the curriculum and the demands for results in the practical world we are sometimes precariously near that professional status which Plato denominated sophistry and caricatured as the art of cookery.

I repeat, as I have said before, that we

approach this position despite our own better judgment and higher aims. I indict no member of our profession. The high, ethical standards of our teachers of speech is apparent from the pages and chapters given over to emphasis on good character. But to say that the speaker must be a 'good man' is not enough when we have no discussion of what constitutes 'goodness' but at the same time have detailed analyses of the ways to 'persuade' (manipulate, even exploit) people. I might suggest curricular changes, or I might, as has Norman Foerster,[8] insist upon better teachers, but the primary concern of these remarks has to do with our so-called self-evident truths, with the need for a redefinition of our purposes and goals.

Let us state our goals so that our students cannot regard success in speech training as simply the acquisition of skills necessary to manipulate people but so that they must look at speech skills in the social context. If this is done it will mean, among other things, that we shall have to rethink and rewrite our discussions on motivation, imaginative appeals, language, and so forth. Let me illustrate by reference to the matter of impelling motives. To treat them, as we have been prone to do, as means of persuasion is to suggest to our students the course of a demagogue. A man's desire for property, his wish to provide for and protect his family, his desire for approval from his fellow men, his love for his country, his appreciation of art and music—these are not simply weaknesses to be exploited at will be the persuaders of men; they are rather sources of inherent values. The statesman, in contrast to the demagogue or the charlatan, will respect them as values; he will measure his appeal so far as he is able in terms of the inherent value rather than in terms of how fully he can exploit for his own purpose.

The fact of the matter is that whether we will or not we force upon our students a decision in terms of value. If we do not discuss our discipline within a context of values, then by assumption and implication we assign the highest values to means—and to means which are conceived in a narrow context of individual skills and power.

We teachers of speech do not face this problem alone as is evidenced by Robert Merton's provocative study of Kate Smith's third war bond drive.[9] On this occasion Kate Smith, through the instrumentality of the radio and by means of appeals largely to sentiment, succeeded in selling 39 million dollars worth of bonds in a single day. A few months later during the fourth bond drive, this radio entertainer by perfecting her techniques increased her total to 110 million dollars worth sold in a single day. Merton describes Miss Smith and her colleagues as 'technicians in sentiment' whose tendency was to obscure the 'moral dimension' of mass persuasion. But he was concerned not only with Miss Smith and the practitioners of persuasion but with himself and others—the scientists who engineered the techniques. He knew full well that Kate Smith and her script writers could not have achieved their dramatic 'persuasion' had it not been for the techniques developed by the social scientists. Says Merton:

> He [the social scientist] may proclaim the ethical neutrality of science, insist upon his exclusive concern with the advancement of knowledge, explain that science deals only with the discovery of uniformities and not with ends and assert that in his role as a detached and dispassionate scientist he has no traffic with values. . . . With its specious and delusory distinction between "ends" and "means" and its insistence that the intrusion of social values into the work of scientists makes for special pleading, this philosophy fails to note that the investigator's social values do influence his choice and definition of problems. The investigator may naively suppose that he is engaged in the value-free activity of research, whereas in fact he may simply

have so defined his research problems that the results will be of use to one group in society, and not to others. His very choice and definition of a problem reflects his tacit values.

I could draw like examples from other writings, from commentaries on public policy, and even from the field of business. That which I ask of speech is neither strange nor impossible, nor is it foreign to our own tradition. Although throughout the history of the teaching of rhetoric there has always been the tendency to narrow the field and seek the quickest results, there has been the counter insistence that, as Socrates said in a comparison of his speech with that of Lysias, 'the speaker who knows the truth may, without any serious purpose, steal away the hearts of hearers.'[10] We must not forget that, although Aristotle conceived of rhetoric as discovering the means of persuasion, when he came to develop his text he found it necessary to enter into a discussion of what constitutes happiness and into an analysis of the good, as well as to discuss the importance of a knowledge of subject matter and the significance of the reasoning process. Even Campbell in his statement of the general ends of speech placed an emphasis upon persuasion far different from ours. His rhetoric, couched as it was in the language of faculty psychology, was concerned with the desirable effect upon the hearers rather than with the manipulation of an audience for the accomplishment of the speaker's purpose.

In our own day the semanticist, despite many criticisms—just, as well as unjust—has taught us much. More than any other rhetorician of our day he has called attention to the fact that rhetoric is something more than technique. He has placed the responsibility squarely upon the speaker to see the relationship between word and fact, symbol and experience. I. A. Richards may not be right in insisting that a study of the relation of language to experience is the only significant contribution to rhetorical theory since Aristotle,[11] but the least that can be said is that we have much to learn from this approach.

Three years ago at our national convention, Andrew Weaver, speaking on the 'Challenge of the Crisis,' said:

> In these latter days some of us seem to have forgotten that it is more important to speak true than it is to speak skillfully.

Continued Mr. Weaver:

> We cannot shift onto the shoulders of other teachers accountability for *what* our students say and concern ourselves exclusively with *how* they say it. The *how* must always be evaluated in the light of *what*. Speech is an indissoluble composite of purposes, attitudes, feelings, ideas, language, voice and visible action, and we neglect any of these at our peril.[12]

We cannot find satisfactory goals in a partial statement. Speech is a broad discipline encompassing not only skills but values, not only tools but responsibilities, not merely isolated techniques but a social context. If we are to retain our place in the liberalizing studies we must lay claim to the whole of our discipline.

[1] Mildred Freburg Berry, The Modern Teacher of Speech Is Obsolete, QJS 32 (1946).143.

[2] William Norwood Brigance, 1946: Year of Decision, QJS 33 (1947).127.

[3] William James, *Pragmatism* (New York, 1908) 112.

[4] Dale Kramer, O'Konski the Great, *New Republic*, November 24, 1947.

[5] Paul M. Berry, Speech Integration and Democracy, *Western Speech* (January, 1945).

[6] This, of course, is also one of its strengths for those who define it in the larger sense.

[7] Quoted by Norman Foerster in *Humanities and the Common Man* (Chapel Hill, 1946) 25.

[8] 'What we are offering today is not so much a trivialized curriculum as a trivialized faculty. The only fundamental way to improve the curriculum is to improve the faculty which designs the curriculum.' Ibid. 24.

[9] Robert K. Merton, *Mass Persuasion: The Social Psychology of a War Bond Drive* (New York, 1946) 185-6.

[10] Phaedrus, 262.

[11] I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (New York and London, 1936).

[12] Andrew T. Weaver, The Challenge of the Crisis, QJS 31 (1945).128.

THE CLARIFIER OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Harold D. Lasswell

THE continuing crisis of democracy has had at least one salutary effect. As citizens of a free society we are scanning the conventional tools which we have inherited for the operation of democracy. Ours is a time of testing and of invention. In no compartment of culture is the ferment of experimentation more intense than in the practice of discussion, whether conducted in the privacy of a small committee meeting or in the glare of a vast public gathering. The present paper is intended to add fuel to the flame of 'discussion about discussion' by outlining for further testing a procedure for large meetings.

Large gatherings are handled in many ways. Sometimes the audience is expected to remain passive: to sit, look, and listen. Latitude is given to applaud, and in some no doubt regrettable instances, to hiss. But in general, the passive audience is supposed to hold its tongue, sit on its hands, relax its feet, and never squirm.

Procedures in the presence of the passive audience vary a great deal. Sometimes a lecturer takes up all available time; and the lecture may be deliberately or inadvertently biased or balanced. Sometimes there is debate: protagonists of 'yes' and 'no' slug it out while the auditors keep still.

During recent years there has been a tendency to discard debates as prize fights and to use panels instead. The most serious objection to the debate is that skills in compromise, in the discovery of a 'middle way,' or in the reposing of a problem are ruled out in advance. Democracy proceeds by persuasion which is a dynamic process during which new alternatives of policy can appear at any moment. According to the panel idea speakers are uncommitted to specific 'sides,' although care is usually taken to see that some dissent exists. The panel method is supposed to put a premium on agreement and to subordinate the vanity of winning to the quest for truth.

That panels are wholly satisfactory cannot be successfully maintained. The virtue of informality too often turns into the vice of confusion. The thread of conversation runs hither and yon, entangling speaker and audience in common incoherence.

When the audience is permitted to broaden its participation beyond an occasional expletive, confusion can be worse confounded. Questions and remarks from the floor fly at the head, midriff, or tail of the topic with little rhyme and less reason.

Self-expression is a privilege and an obligation where democracy thrives, and we can endure a vast cackle of sheer chatter in the hope of eventual consensus and enlightenment. When they begin by renouncing democratic values, proposals to modify the conduct of public gatherings cannot be tolerated. We respect even the 'bores' and the 'dopes' for their common humanity and destiny. But true democracy is neither chaos nor limitless self-indulgence. The democratic way of life is stronger and more efficient when men and women voluntarily discipline themselves to keep still when they have nothing useful to say.

HAROLD D. LASSWELL *is Professor of Law at Yale University Law School. He is the author of several books on Communications, Propaganda, and Public Opinion.*

But this discipline needs to be *voluntary* and not imposed as a means of stopping the mouth of the public for the benefit of an official few.

We know from experience that suggestions looking toward rational modes of public discussion can commend themselves to the judgment of the community. The public has learned to acquiesce in parliamentary rules of order. The community has learned to agree to the rigid routine of courts. It is not beyond the capacity of the general public to insist upon more rational ways of conducting public discussion.

We need make no mystery of what is meant by a rational act. An act is rational when it fosters the values sought in *fact* as well as in *intent*. In a democratic society policies are rational when they maintain and enlarge freedom. Since we cannot be certain in advance whether a given line of action will in fact be rational we take precautions in order to increase the probability that what we decide will, in the end, turn out to be rational. When we act privately we can take the precaution of pausing to reflect and to gather knowledge. When we act with others similar precautions are not impossible. And it is the precautions—the devices capable of improving collective rationality in public discussion—with which we are now concerned.

The probability of a rational choice is improved when we clarify the goals and alternatives of action and appraise them in the light of available knowledge and of imagined contingencies. Consider such an issue as universal military training. The first question to be dealt with among discussants is what goal values are sought. Are they agreed that the security of the nation is the chief goal? If not, some basis of agreement must be found or the discussion abandoned. If there is agreement on goal it becomes relevant to consider whether universal training will affect security in the kind of crisis most likely to arise in the future. Appraisal of the future calls for the critical use of knowledge of past trend and of the factors affecting security.

If the focus of audience attention is to be economically directed to pertinent issues orderly procedure is essential. As a means to the rational guidance of public thought and talk it is proposed to develop and to popularize the role of clarifier. Upon the clarifier falls the burden of making sure that goals are made explicit, that alternatives are lucidly expressed, that future contingencies are stated, and that knowledge of pertinent trends and factors is utilized in the discussion. The clarifier tries to see that ambiguous statements are modified until they become unambiguous or are dismissed as too vague to contribute to the discussion. The clarifier is a surrogate of the audience: he raises in an orderly way the questions which the audience would ask if its members had time to prepare and to arrange the questions in a coherent sequence.

The clarifier is not a chairman, although many moderators have been successful clarifiers as well as chairmen. It is a mistake to expect the moderator to double as chairman and clarifier; the functions are too difficult. The chairman of a large gathering has a most delicate, responsible, and varied task. He must watch the intellectual flow and keep all the non-intellectual factors that affect the proceedings under control. The chairman considers whether the room needs ventilation, or the amplifiers are too loud, or the lights are too bright, or the corridor noises are too disturbing; or whether a wisecrack is a timely means of relieving tension, or an admonition is needed to reduce interruptions, and so on. All these matters are

too distracting to enable most chairmen to do more than keep the intellectual part of the proceedings somewhere near the track. But more than an approximation of the track is needed if complex issues are to be helpfully explored. Hence, the need of a different person to take over the clarifying function.

In many ways the closest parallel to the procedure we have in mind is that of the examiner of a House or Senatorial Committee who takes over the chief interrogation of witnesses. Sometimes the chairman of such a committee does a magnificent job of clarification—distinguished for intelligence, fairness, and dispatch. Former Senator Robert M. LaFollette was well spoken of among his colleagues for his talent in this role. Future clarifiers will do well to read the transcript of some of the hearings in which he took a major part. Hearings before administrative commissions often exemplify the clarifying function. The Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission are among the agencies whose public hearings may be conducted before sizeable audiences. For other examples of the clarifier we look to the courts where the judge occasionally steps into the proceedings for the purpose of protecting a witness from an aggressive lawyer-examiner or in order to disentangle a complicated mass of testimony. Lawyer-examiners are committed to definite sides in the controversy before the court and are not, therefore, equivalent to the clarifier who serves the audience as a whole by bringing out all facets of a problem in a non-partisan spirit. When the court delegates an examiner to hear evidence we have a procedure that closely resembles what we are recommending for the general audience.

If the clarifier is to act most effectively long speeches are to be avoided, and everyone needs to understand that the clarifier is permitted, and expected, to interrupt. Unless the function of the clarifier is understood he will be looked upon at first as a mere exhibitionist.

It is safe to forecast that the clarifier will have several indirect effects on public discussion. On general principles, speakers, who regard themselves as privileged and resent interruption, should be discouraged; and the procedure here outlined can contribute to this glorious end. If modern semantics has taught—or reminded us—of anything about language it is that most discourse is ambiguous and that what usually passes for communication is a thickening fog of mis-, non-, and partial understanding. Smoothness of oratorical style is frequently a form of impostorship in which terms are intoned rather than defined. The willingness to be interrupted, to be challenged for explanation, is a virtue befitting a democrat in pursuit of enlightenment.

Much of what the clarifier tries to do can be assisted by visual materials. Maps, charts, and cartoons often say what needs to be said more memorably and lucidly than speeches. Slides, film strips, and films can share experience more effectively than many lectures. The combination of television and clarification can expedite a process which has been accelerated by other technical innovations. The radio made a dinosaur of florid oratory, and television can do away with other forms of public irrelevance.

It is worth remembering that efficient communication about issues is not entirely restricted to matter-of-fact and argumentative statements. There is a place for fictional presentation of alternative policies. The dramatic episode can intensify insight, and the clarifier can select the sequence of experience that promises to lead the audience to the highest level of understanding.

I underline the creative impact of technical gadgets upon the process of communication, especially when correlated with the findings of psychology, social psychology, and sociology. It is increasingly evident that the socio-personal sciences are transforming man's conception of himself and modifying his ways of doing things. Not the least of the achievements which affect democracy is the perfecting of procedures by which everyone has a say and also has something worth saying. Shared power and shared respect are not the only values of a free society: there is also shared enlightenment.

The clarifying function calls for poise, alertness, and experience. Once the conception of a clarifier has been established and the social image is understood, persons of modest, native ability can perform the function in acceptable fashion. Experience can be gained in schools, churches, and other institutions so that an ever enlarging reserve is available for all public occasions. Teams of chairmen and clarifiers will gain local, and then larger, renown and gradually improve the level of public discussion.[1]

[1] The present writer spoke of the clarifier in the Chi Omega Lectures, *Democracy through Public Opinion* (Menasha, Wisconsin, 1941). Concerning democracy see *The Analysis of Political Behaviour; An Empirical Approach* (Oxford, 1948).

THE MODERATOR'S FUNCTION IN GROUP THINKING

William E. Utterback

PROBABLY all thoughtful students of democracy share Professor Lasswell's view, expressed in the preceding article, that the democratic process needs improving and especially that public discussion must be made more effective. We have proceeded too long on the assumption that a miscellaneous collection of facts, arguments, and appeals run through the hopper of public discussion necessarily emerges as political wisdom. The result is quite as likely to be utter confusion. To improve the quality of public discussion in large meetings Professor Lasswell suggests that in addition to a chairman performing the functions traditionally assigned to him the audience should have the professional services of a 'clarifier.' The clarifier would make no contribution to the substance of the argument, but acting as a surrogate of the audience, he would clarify ambiguous statements and direct discussion to those considerations on which decision logically must turn. The suggestion deserves study and a trial.

Professor Lasswell finds precedents for the office of the clarifier in the procedures of the House and Senatorial Committee, the administrative commission, and the law court. He might have found even clearer precedent in the methods employed by the moderator of small group discussion. A brief discussion of the function of the moderator in group thinking may throw further light on the role of the clarifier.

The phrase *group thinking* suggests a group of five to twenty persons seated around a table, engaged in a cooperative effort to solve a common problem, and conducting their deliberations by informal conversation. Increasingly such discussion is recognized as an essential part of the democratic process. Committees, staffs, boards, and councils and conferences of all kinds deal constantly with economic and political problems at every level of cooperative effort from the community council to the international conference. Upon the effectiveness of these deliberations depends very largely the success of democratic government.

In view of its importance and its wide use it is perhaps strange that we know so little about group thinking. In this field tradition provides us with no analogue to the rules which govern that other essential democratic process, parliamentary debate. And only in recent years have we begun to study the nature of group thinking, to consider what procedures facilitate it, and to inquire what function, if any, is performed by the moderator.

Three different views are widely held regarding the nature of the moderator's contribution to the process. According to one view the moderator is simply a presiding officer enforcing in informal and flexible fashion such rules of parliamentary procedure as seem to be applicable to the deliberation of a small group. In this view what goes on around the conference table does not differ essentially from parliamentary debate, nor does the presiding officer perform any function other than that of presiding over debate.

A second view is that the moderator is essentially a teacher—presumably wiser

WILLIAM E. UTTERBACK *is Associate Professor of Speech at Ohio State University and Director of the Ohio State University Discussion Service.*

or better informed than the members of the group—who employs question and answer as a method of instruction. Those who employ the 'discussion method' in the classroom seldom get very far from this conception.

A third view is that the moderator is primarily a stimulator of conversation. By geniality of manner and warmth of personality he places the group at its ease while his suggestions and comments challenge interest and provoke discussion.

It is the purpose of this article to suggest that all of these views of the moderator's function misconceive the nature of group thinking, that the moderator performs certain functions indispensable to cooperative thinking, and that these functions have little in common with the duties of the presiding officer, the teacher, or the mere stimulator of discussion.

Discussion of group thinking often begins and ends with the observation that methodical search for the solution of a problem, whether by an individual or a group, involves the use of certain procedures dictated by the nature of the problem-solving process. The first step, it is usually suggested, is to define the problem in as specific and unambiguous terms as possible; and the next, to review the principal facts surrounding the problem. Consideration is then given to the objectives to be attained, the values to be realized or conserved; in short, to the criteria by which any proposed solution is to be evaluated. Each of the possible solutions is then examined in turn, and the evidence on each is appraised. The final step is decision based on examination of the evidence.

There can be no question that a group, like an individual, must follow some such pattern to reach a rational decision. But to say this and no more is to stop short of considering the real problem of group thinking. For when a group attempts to follow the pattern, a whole series of difficulties arises from the fact that many minds rather than one are involved. It is these difficulties that necessitate the services of a moderator.

The principal difficulties encountered by a group attempting to think together concern participation, focusing attention, and achieving clarity.

For fruitful discussion each member of the group must, in a sense, think aloud. Unless all members contribute freely to the common pool from their information and experience the resources of the group cannot be brought to bear on the problem. And unless it is clear to the group as a whole how each member is reacting to the contributions made there is no way to reach a common understanding. It is necessary, therefore, that all members speak freely and frankly. This free and general participation is not ordinarily to be expected of a group engaged in undirected conversation. The more aggressive will dominate the conversation while the reticent speak seldom or not at all. Those eager to speak will attempt to talk at the same time or will split the group into fragments by engaging in private conversation. This diversity of temperament represented in any group will balk the attempt at cooperative thinking unless conversation is regulated by someone who maintains his impartiality by remaining outside of the argument. Regulating discussion is, perhaps, an obvious and elementary function of the moderator, but it is essential to group thinking.

Another difficulty arises from the fact that without assistance the members of a group usually will not concentrate their attention on the same thing at the same time. Even when the group has agreed in advance on an agenda indicating in what order it is to consider the various issues involved in the problem there is a strong tendency for each member to divert discussion from the issue under

consideration to the one in which he is personally most interested. And when this difficulty is avoided another like it may be encountered. As each issue is threshed out several conflicts of opinion may arise. Attention must be focused on each successively if any of them are to be resolved. But no one of the conflicts has the right of way, and each member will address himself to the one which interests him most. As a result the conversation will bob back and forth from one disputed point to another, and no progress can be made on any of them. These difficulties in the focusing of attention do not necessarily imply want of mental capacity in the members of the group. They arise in large part from the fact that several minds cannot act together without the help of a coordinator.

The individual problem solver must fight a constant battle to achieve clarity of thought, and he may congratulate himself if his lapses into confusion are only occasional and temporary. As more minds attempt to think together the danger of confusion of thought increases by geometric progression. Among the principal sources of confusion is the inability of the members of the group to take stock of the general situation as it develops. Each is directing his attention to the matter of the moment rather than to the broad drift of the argument or to the situation as a whole. Of necessity he takes a worm's-eye rather than a bird's-eye view of what is going on, and a sense of perspective and direction is quickly lost. This difficulty may be illustrated in several ways.

If the group is to understand what it is about it must keep in view those considerations on which decision logically must turn; that is, it must continuously be aware of the agenda it is following. Very few groups can adhere to such a logical pattern in discussion though it helps if each member has before him a typed copy of the agenda.

As the group takes up any particular issue listed in the agenda, discussion first enters an exploratory phase in which members speak up in rapid succession, each stating his position and commenting on the contributions made by the others.

This step is necessary to intelligent consideration of the issue, for the group must know about where each of its members stands before it is possible for the group to determine on what points attention should be concentrated. But if left to its own devices the group will usually continue indefinitely in this exploratory phase, for each member is intent upon the point he wishes to make or upon expressing his reaction to a point made by another. As more and more points are made and commented on the situation grows more complex until soon so many considerations are in the air that no one can remember what anyone has said. The first contribution, like a pebble dropped into a pond, has created an area of agitation which widens so rapidly in all directions that soon the eye cannot take it in.

As soon as the exploratory phase has made clear about where each member stands it should be terminated and stock taken of the situation. To one standing outside the argument and viewing the situation as a whole it may have become apparent that all are in agreement on certain points. These points should be clearly stated and set aside as requiring no further discussion. It may also have become clear that on certain other points there is difference of opinion. The points of conflict should be formulated clearly so that each may be taken up in turn. Statement of the controversial issues and their orderly discussion are essential if any real progress is to be made. And the discussion can be so directed only by

one who, not himself a party to the argument, is able to view the situation as a whole.

To illustrate further the need for the help of someone who makes it his business to look at the total situation consider what happens frequently when the group is trying to thresh out a conflict of opinion. *A* asserts that price controls would discourage production; and when challenged by *B* to support the assertion, *A* replies that anything which discourages investment must necessarily discourage the expansion of production. *B* accepts the latter point but still does not accept the conclusion. Discussion appears to have reached an impasse. The two members disagree but neither can quite see why, and each goes on repeating what he has already said in a crescendo of emphasis. The difficulty is that *B's* real objection is to the unexpressed premise of *A's* argument, that price controls will discourage investment. It is often very difficult for the immediate parties to the argument to see the exact point of difference between them though it may be apparent at once to an alert moderator who is standing outside the conflict. Taking in the situation at a glance the moderator completes *A's* argument and directs discussion to the question whether price controls would discourage investment.

Difficulties in achieving a sufficiently general participation to make the resources of the entire group available for solution of the problem, difficulties in keeping the attention of many persons focused on the same thing at the same time, and difficulties arising from the fact that each participant has his eye too close to the page, as it were, to take in the situation as a whole are peculiar to group discussion. They arise from the fact that several minds rather than one are engaged cooperatively in the same enterprise. Such difficulties do not mean that the members of the group lack mental discipline. They arise almost as frequently when the group is composed of well informed persons thoroughly accustomed to conference.

From what has been said it follows that no group, however experienced, can think together effectively without the services of a moderator, who makes no contribution to the substance of the argument but performs an indispensable professional service in regulating, focusing, and clarifying discussion. To perform this service well is not an easy task. It requires emotional maturity, mental alertness, and a sense of method; and it is not surprising that expert moderators are as rare as they are valuable.

The necessary attitudes and skills, however, can be taught. It would seem a proper function of college and university departments of speech not only to investigate the process of group thinking and to train students to participate in it effectively, but especially to provide training in the art of moderating discussion. For the conference, in its many forms, is a speech situation at least as important to the democratic process as the public forum.

THE DISCUSSION TECHNIQUES OF THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

Leland T. Chapin

DURING the past two years the Brookings Institution of Washington, D. C., has developed a program which should be of interest to teachers in the field of speech. When this Institution was founded in 1927, it had two primary purposes: 1. to aid constructively in the development of sound national policies, and 2. to offer training of a supergraduate character to students of the social sciences.[1] Its principal method of realizing these purposes has been through research.

In what is termed a 'logical extension' of this program, it is now developing a 'type of analysis of major current problems in international affairs that is not usually found in specialized textbooks and general treatises on the subject.'[2] The principal method of developing this type of analysis is through specialized discussion techniques conducted in annual seminars.

This realistic approach has been developed under the direction of Leo Pasvolsky, formerly Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, who is at present Director of the International Studies Group of the Brookings Institution. In February, 1947, he gathered a group of teachers and government officials to discuss the possibility of conducting an annual seminar. A second meeting was held at the University of Virginia during June of the same year, and agenda were drawn up for the first seminar at Dartmouth College in August.

The seminar was inaugurated with two objectives in mind:

1. To test the feasibility of reproducing, outside the government, the type of discussion that takes place in the government in the formulation of foreign policies.
2. To provide the carefully selected participants in the discussion seminar with an opportunity for the stimulating exchange of views.

The experiment was considered sufficiently successful to warrant special grants of funds from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Rockefeller Foundation to finance the seminars and the research and publication activities connected with them.

The second annual seminar was held at Stanford University, from June 21 to July 3, 1948. Approximately 140 experts in government, business, teaching, research, and officers of the armed services were invited at the expense of the Brookings Institution to attend the 1948 seminar.

While the subject matter discussed naturally changed with the development of new issues in the rapidly shifting kaleidoscope of events, the basic techniques underlying the discussions remained essentially the same.

The seminars are planned in such a way that the participants will place themselves in the position of a group of government officials who must keep in mind the broad field of policy-making while they attempt to discharge their duties in making specific recommendations to the highest officials in the government. In other words, an attempt is made to impress upon each individual the necessity to weigh the relative merit of his proposal, not only in the light of

LELAND T. CHAPIN *is Associate Professor of Speech and Drama at Stanford University and is a member of the* ASSOCIATION'S *Committee on Contemporary Public Address.*

alternatives offered on the same issue in the same governmental department, but in the light of other possible policy decisions which are being considered in other governmental departments, and how satisfactory these proposals will be in forming the general policy adopted at the highest level.

Admittedly, this 'attitude of relativity' is difficult to maintain in discussion. It places a premium on both general understanding and judgment. In order to secure this atmosphere, three features were devised:

1. To hold plenary sessions, in which the main elements of the broad world picture were discussed in relation to the position of the United States in world affairs.
2. To insure appropriate representation from business, university, state department, and the armed services in each of the succeeding round tables.
3. To provide each round table with a leader experienced in the duties and responsibilities of a discussion chairman.

The success of the seminars thus far has been due to several reasons:

1. The careful selection of participants.

At the Stanford conference, there were seventeen members of the Department of State, eight army officers, five naval officers, twelve professors of history, twenty-six professors of government and international relations, six professors of law, four professors of economics, one professor of anthropology, nine college presidents, four deans of graduate schools, four directors of research institutes, four directors of research foundations, five business executives, four journalists, four representatives from the staff of the United Nations, as well as representatives from the Federal Reserve Board, the International Bank, the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, the U.S. Tariff Commission, the U.S. Office of Education, the Pan-American Union, the Institute of World Affairs, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the League of Women Voters, the Committee on International Educational Exchange, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

2. Constant emphasis on the policy-making process.

In each round table, the statement of the specific problem followed the procedure of accepting as the frame of reference for the consideration of the problem certain established principles and objectives of the United States. While these objectives are subject to review, as the result of changes at home or abroad, or because the objectives themselves are discovered to be inherently unsound, the analyst of a problem as it is actually presented for decision within the government is far more concerned with the frame of reference than the teacher in the classroom, or the debater on the platform. The substantive parts of the papers growing out of the round-table discussions consist of two memoranda:

1. The background of the problem.
2. The analysis of the specific problem, and the discussion of issues and alternatives.

At the conclusion of the discussions, reports are prepared by the round-table secretaries. These reports are later utilized by the staff of the Brookings International Studies Group in revising those discussion papers that later appear in its annual volume *Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy, A Study Guide*.

The policy-making process in the government requires one final step: recommending to the policy-making officer a course of action selected from the available alternatives. This part of the process does not take place in the seminar discussion, since The Brookings Institu-

tion is more interested in a full examination of issues and alternatives than in an answer to the problem. Moreover, for the purposes of the seminar, a recommended course of action is not necessary, since free discussion and thorough examination of the issues and alternatives usually involves consideration of the relative merits of each possible course of action.

3. A well organized system of reporting the discussions and procedures of every discussion of the seminar.

The reporters are carefully selected. They must have a broad background in international relations; their accuracy and objectivity must not be matter of chance. They must be able to serve their round tables in the same manner as government personnel who constitute the secretariats of departmental and interdepartmental committees, international organizations, and official international conferences. An efficient secretariat serves to assure a complete report for the use of the staff of the International Studies Group, the participants of the seminar, and others who may be interested.

4. Full preparation of materials in advance of the seminar.

The Staff of the International Studies Group prepares the discussion papers, selecting major problems for treatment. Each of these problems is prepared in two memoranda as indicated above and sent to participants for their study in advance of the seminar meeting.[1] This too is in accordance with general governmental practice where papers setting forth views on a problem under consideration are circulated to parties directly concerned for comment prior to making a recommendation.

Subsequent to the seminar, the Brookings Institution publishes at the beginning of each academic year its volume *Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy*, part of which consists of the seminar discussion papers that have been revised in the light of the seminar proceedings. The Institution also publishes monthly a summary of world events, *Current Developments in United States Foreign Policy*, which keeps the factual background of the Study Guide materials up to date. These publications are intended for classroom use, for discussion groups, and as an aid to writers and public lecturers.

In summary, the following observations might be appropriate:

1. A research institution has developed, on the supergraduate level, techniques of discussion which have two main objectives:

a. To aid in the development of an informal and responsible American public opinion on foreign policy.

b. To contribute toward a more realistic training of American specialists in international relations that are required today in government, in business, and in other agencies operating abroad.[3]

2. While these techniques have been developed for specialized purposes, they might be used by teachers of public discussion when the subject matter involves the consideration of contemporary national and international affairs.

3. The techniques used by the Brookings Institution do not differ greatly ings Institution do not differ greatly from the methods suggested by leading authorities on public discussion, but the emphasis on the relative merit of each proposal within the framework of broad policy decisions, should encourage understanding, tolerance, and a sense of maturity on the part of undergraduate students.

[1] The Brookings Institution, *Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy, A Study Guide, 1947-48* (Washington, D. C.) inside cover.

[2] *Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy, A Study Guide, 1948-49* iii.

[3] Ibid. iii.

EFFECTIVE SPEAKING IN CONGRESS

Jerry Voorhis

THE Congress of the United States consists of all sorts of people and deals with all sorts of problems under all sorts of conditions. It is impossible, therefore, to say that any one type of speech is 'most effective' under all circumstances.

There are times when the House or Senate is in a mood for high oratory—even for passionate emotional appeals. Memorial exercises, observances of great events, and occasions when members feel themselves confronted with a profound crisis are such times. Members of Congress are seldom lacking in sentiment. Their task of getting themselves elected depends in large part upon their ability to appeal to the sentiments as well as to the reason of constituents. So there are times and seasons when the comparatively few competent orators in Congress can, with effect, employ their talents.

But such occasions are rare and generally speaking, 'old fashioned oratory' while enjoyed by members is listened to with tolerance rather than with attention or readiness to be persuaded.

From the point of view of pure forensics the Congress itself is far less exacting an audience than are most audiences of the members' home constituents, probably because the people at home are not called upon to vote upon bills. They come simply to listen and are under no such necessity to make clear-cut 'yes or no' decisions on specific issues as are the members of Congress. Hence, the popular audience wants a speech 'that is a *speech*' with a beginning, a middle, and an end, with three or five or ten or some other number of 'main points.' They want the speech well delivered and will be critical if it is not so. And they like to be entertained as well as to have their emotions aroused. Finally, they prefer broad concepts to detailed argument, and they seek a clear distinction between 'right' and 'wrong' on important questions.

In Congress itself the situation is different. There the 'audience' is not composed of people accustomed to listening to others but of potential speakers, most of whom will, at the beginning of a speech at least, harbor the belief that they themselves could do the job better. Moreover, most Congressional speeches are made upon bills or amendments about to be voted upon. The one paramount desire of the members is to be as certain as possible that they can defend the position they will take when the vote is cast. This is almost—but not quite—the same as saying that the members want to be sure that they cast a correct vote when the roll is called. They want more than that. They want to know as nearly as possible the exact reasons for their own actions. Aside from the desire of a high percentage of members to feel they have done the right thing, there looms the absolute necessity (from the Congressman's viewpoint) of persuading his constituents that he did the right thing.

As a result neither the manner of delivery nor the eloquence of the language nor the quality of the speaker's

JERRY VOORHIS *is a graduate of Yale University and Claremont College. He was a lecturer at Pomona College from 1930 to 1935; and he represented the Twelfth California District in Congress from 1937 to 1947. At present Mr. Voorhis is the Executive Secretary of The Cooperative League of the United States.*

voice nor many of the other factors that make for victory in oratorical contests and even in political campaigns make any very great contribution to the effectiveness of a Congressional speech. One member, now deceased, used to twine himself around the speaker's stand, hold his mouth directly against the loud speaker, and never move from that position during the entire course of his address. His speeches were no less—and no more—effective than those of another member who makes a practice of rushing from one extreme corner of 'the well' to the other while addressing the House. I doubt that the erudite choice of exact phraseology of which some members are capable gives them any considerable advantage over others whose grammar is not even correct. And certainly spontaneous speech from notes—or even without them—is far more effective though necessarily less polished than the reading of a prepared manuscript. The chief purposes of a prepared manuscript, in fact, are to be sure one's speech is accurately reproduced in the *Record* and for distribution to the press. But it is wisest for the member who is armed with such a manuscript to outline it and to speak from his outline rather than from the manuscript itself if he really desires to impress his listeners.

By and large it may be said that evident sincerity, simple directness and naturalness of delivery, and assured self-confidence are vital factors in Congressional speaking.

But the most important element of all is persuasive content—fact and argument which are clear and convincing not only to the speaker but to the listening members. The most telling speeches, in the House at any rate, are of no more than five-minutes duration. There is no time for anything except the very meat of the argument. It is best if the speech can be given with an appearance of somewhat reserved confidence. Despite the short time allowed, effectiveness is markedly lessened if the speaker permits himself to appear excited or to speak at too rapid a rate. Again, the one indispensable factor in effective Congressional speaking is to give the House or Senate the impression that they are listening to one who has mastered all the essential facts and is perfectly certain he is right.

Of course the more intelligent the speaker the less certain he can be that all the right is on his side. And I firmly believe Congress would do a better job if speakers more frequently confessed the possible weaknesses in their own positions and admitted the points on which they are not positive. But such is the rigor of party discipline that members attempting this usually find the vocal members of the opposite party gleefully pressing 'an advantage' rather than responding with the corresponding admission that *their* own arguments may not be completely flawless.

In conclusion it must be said that from time to time a great speech is made in the House or the Senate. Then it is true that eloquence combines with argument, and deep, true sentiment with fact. But the day to day effective speaking in Congress is of the character described in earlier paragraphs. The very best speeches do, of course, partake of the oratorical brilliance and beauty of the past. While Congress ordinarily is influenced by content rather than by manner of presentation or appeal to the emotions, it would be something other than the body of very human men and women which it is, if the latter factors did not still add power to a presentation of the facts.

SHERIDAN AGAINST WARREN HASTINGS

Lewis Gibbs

Richard Brinsley Sheridan: Orator

It is easy to overlook the fact that the author of *The School for Scandal* was also a politician and an orator; but this is not, after all, very surprising, for his political career, though interesting, was not of outstanding importance, and when we think of Fox and Pitt we rarely remember that Sheridan was a distinguished follower of the former and a bitter and redoubtable enemy of the latter. Moreover, the fame of an orator soon wears thin. The speech that held an audience spellbound is apt to seem remarkably uninspiring when it appears in cold print. But two, at least, of Sheridan's speeches—those he made against Warren Hastings—have not been forgotten; and to this day any mention of the name of the great Governor-General brings with it a fleeting memory of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, dramatist, manager of Drury Lane Theatre, and Member of Parliament.

Sheridan was Irish which in some ways was a drawback, the national pride of the English causing them to look down upon both the Irish and the Scotch. It was a decided disadvantage to a man in public life to have an Irish accent; but Sheridan got rid of his or, at any rate, of all that would have been thought objectionable in it at an early age. When he entered Parliament his voice was described as very pleasant which was more than could be said for that of his famous countryman and contemporary, Burke. Sheridan, however, was brought to England as a boy and went to school at Harrow. Besides, his father Thomas Sheridan, an actor and theatre manager, was a well-known and very capable teacher of elocution. As an actor he could not, of course, hope to rival Garrick; and as a manager he had the unhappy experience of seeing his Dublin theatre wrecked by a high-spirited and patriotic audience; but as a teacher of elocution he had some distinguished pupils. He also gave lectures on the subject, published a dictionary and other works, and was given the degree of Master of Arts at both Oxford and Cambridge. Dr. Johnson looked with a disapproving eye on some of his activities and considered that an Irishman had no business to set up as an authority on the pronunciation of English. Johnson also disliked his somewhat pompous manner. 'Why, Sir,' he declared, 'Sherry is dull, naturally dull; but it must have taken him a great deal of pains to become what we now see him. Such an excess of stupidity, Sir, is not in nature.'

When Sheridan left Harrow, at the age of eighteen, he and his brother were instructed by their father in English grammar and oratory. Soon afterwards the family moved to Bath where Thomas Sheridan tried to set up an academy for teaching those useful subjects to young gentlemen. In this establishment the youthful Richard Brinsley, as yet unknown to fame, was to have held the slightly surprising post of 'rhetorical usher'; but the project came to nothing. There were, however, 'Attic Entertainments,' where the audiences were edified by a discourse on oratory after which they were able to enjoy the singing of

LEWIS GIBBS *of Purley, Surrey, England, is the author of a recent biography of Richard Brinsley Sheridan.*

the lovely Elizabeth Linley whom Richard Brinsley escorted in her flight to France in 1772 and married in the following year. Altogether, it is clear that he had very useful training which must have stood him in good stead when the time came for him to speak in public.

It was not until 1780, when he entered Parliament, that Sheridan had any occasion to try his oratorical powers. By that time he had written all his plays except 'Pizarro' and had, in fact, given up authorship to embark on a political career; but he continued to be the manager of Drury Lane because he had no other source of income. He was a Whig, and thus, like Fox and Burke, opposed the war in America.

His first speech was considered disappointing: he did not, remarked Horace Walpole, make the figure expected. 'It is in me, however,' said Sheridan, 'and by G—— it shall come out.' It did come out. Within a year he was regarded as one of the young men who had shown exceptional quality. Another was William Pitt who had taken his seat at the same time as Sheridan and was destined to become Prime Minister. Sheridan's destiny was very different: he was to spend thirty years in opposition.

As a speaker Sheridan was both witty and forceful, and at his best he was brilliant. Of all the followers of Fox he was, it was said, the first in genius and power. His manner was engaging and he never lost his temper. Burke—a greater man than Sheridan—was often heard with impatience and not infrequently interrupted by groans; but Sheridan could obtain a hearing at any time. Long afterwards, Byron, who did not hear Sheridan at his best, declared that he was the only Parliamentary speaker he had ever wished to hear at greater length; and according to Lady Hester Stanhope, Pitt feared Sheridan more than he feared Fox.

In those leisured and spacious days eloquence was formal and unhurried. Sheridan's speeches were always carefully prepared though he did not advertise the fact. He was generally considered idle and careless, and everybody knew that he never rose before noon; but he often spent those mornings in bed preparing what he meant to say in the House.

By 1785, his reputation was thoroughly established; and he had become one of the leading Whigs. It was in 1785 that Warren Hastings rturned to England from India.

The Case Against Hastings

Hastings had saved the East India Company's posessions and secured the British supremacy in times of the most extreme difficulty and danger. His own council had opposed him, and he had actually fought a duel with one member of it—Philip Francis, who nursed an implacable and rancorous hatred and brought it with him, together with a fortune of £80,000, when he came home.

It was inevitable that during such an administration the Governor-General should have done many things which his enemies could easily misrepresent and which might seem arbitrary and unjustifiable even to men who bore him no personal ill-will. Even today it is hardly possible to pronounce a plain and unqualified guilty or not guilty, though it is clear that Hastings was convinced of his own innocence and quite prepared to face his accusers, and that he had done nothing for his own profit.

The public conscience was uneasy about the state of affairs in India, and Hastings had already been censured by a committee of enquiry. The House of Commons had gone so far as to pass a

resolution to recall him, but the Company refused to act on it. He had now resigned of his own accord. He was fifty-three and had served for thirty-five years. Nobody saw anything in his appearance to suggest that he had oppressed millions of his fellow-creatures or wielded powers far more absolute and extensive than the British constitution allowed to King George III. He was spare in figure, of medium height, and bald.

Four days after Hastings reached England, Burke fired the first shot in the campaign by giving notice to the House that he would bring forward a motion on the administration of the late Governor General. Burke, a passionate hater of injustice and an equally passionate defender of established order, was fully convinced of the guilt of Hastings. He had studied the question thoroughly but had got much of his information, and some of his conclusions, from the malignant Francis. Early in 1786 he drew up an impressive array of charges. Hastings was allowed to make a general reply in the House, but he got no good by it. The reply took two days to read and merely tired the members. From first to last he insisted on justifying his actions and refused to urge that his splendid services should be taken into consideration.

The proceedings against him took the form of an impeachment; that is, he was accused by the Commons and tried by the Lords, with the Lord Chancellor at their head. To begin with, the various charges were debated and voted upon in the House of Commons. The first, moved by Burke, was lost, though only on a technical point. The second, moved by Fox, was carried by a majority of forty; Pitt, to everyone's surprise, voted in favor of it, and thus made it clear that the government did not mean to defend Hastings. The third charge, relating to the Begums of Oude, was moved by Sheridan; and here it will be as well to explain briefly what its subject was.

The events in question took place in 1781 when the situation in India was critical. The Carnatic had been overrun by Hyder Ali, and Hastings himself had been forced to face a dangerous insurrection in Benares. He had desperately needed money and had turned for it to the vizier of Oude who was in debt to the Company; but the vizier declared that he was completely unable to pay. However, there was a treasure which had been amassed by the late vizier and was in the possession of the present ruler's mother and grandmother. These ladies were the 'Begums' whom Sheridan's eloquence made famous. The present vizier had already laid claim to a share of the treasure and had received £500,000, in return for which he recognized the right of the princesses to the remainder of the treasure—an agreement which was approved by the Company.

Hastings now made a treaty with the vizier, providing, among other things, that the latter should seize the rest of the treasure. It was this that brought up the subject of 'Filial Piety,' on which Sheridan dwelt to such purpose that he reduced many of his hearers to tears. Hastings justified himself by accusing the Begums of aiding the rebellion in Benares. The ladies, of course, protested their innocence, and it cannot be said that their guilt was ever satisfactorily proved. But Hastings was dealing with an emergency: he was not alone in believing them guilty, and in the last resort had to rely on his own judgment.

The vizier was still extremely reluctant to seize the treasure; but at last, under strong pressure from Hastings, he did so. He occupied the palace of the Begums, but he was unable to lay hands on the treasure before he had fettered

the eunuchs in charge of it and put them to torture. Such were the bare facts upon which Sheridan based his two celebrated speeches.

He delivered the first in the House of Commons on 7 February 1787. The speech began at half-past six and ended at midnight, and was made with such fluency that in the opinion of one hearer it would have taken twice as long to read it. Its effect was extraordinary: 'the whole House, the members, peers, and strangers involuntarily joined in a tumult of applause.' An abler speech, said Pitt, perhaps had never been made. It was 'acknowledged on all sides of the House,' reported the *Gentlemen's Magazine,* 'to be the most astoninshing effort of eloquence, argument, and wit united, of which there is any record or tradition.' Fox declared it to be the best speech ever made within the walls of Parliament, and the Earl of Chatham described it as the greatest imaginable exertion of the human mind. The debate was adjourned so that the vote should not be taken while members were under the influence of such emotion. The report, unfortunately, is so meagre that it gives only a faint idea of the original; but in all likelihood this was Sheridan's greatest achievement in oratory.

In Westminster Hall

The motion that Hastings should be impeached of high crimes and misdemeanors was carried in May 1787, and on the 13th of February in the following year the trial began in Westminster Hall, that historic edifice whose walls had been built in the time of William Rufus and whose magnificently timbered roof dated from the reign of Richard II. There, nearly a century and a half earlier, King Charles I had faced his judges. The hall was now hung with scarlet and fitted with galleries and with boxes for the Royal Family, the accused and his counsel, and the 'managers'—that is, the twenty members of the House of Commons who had been chosen to conduct the prosecution. Sheridan, Burke, and Fox were among them.

After the preliminaries Burke opened the charges in general in a speech which lasted four days, and on the thirty-second day of the trial Sheridan's turn came. His task was a difficult one: already he had made a speech which had gained boundless admiration, and he now had to make another on the same subject. Fox advised him to repeat the earlier one; but Sheridan, determined to rival Burke in the scope and magnificence of his oratory, did not take the advice. Expectation ran high. As much as £50 was paid for a seat, and numbers of people took the precaution of sleeping in neighboring coffee-houses and taverns the night before so as to be sure of a good place. By half-past six in the morning Palace Yard was crowded, and when the doors were opened many ladies lost their shoes, and some their hats, in the struggle to get in.

Sheridan began nervously and for a short while his voice seemed to falter. Once his memory failed him, but he recovered and thereafter spoke clearly and confidently. His speech that day, 3 June, lasted four and a half hours. He continued on the 6th of June and again on the 10th, when his remarks were cut short by indisposition. On the 13th he concluded with an impassioned exhortation to the peers to do 'the greatest deed of mercy for the world that the earth has ever yet received from any hand but Heaven'; whereupon he sank back into the arms of Burke who assisted him to his chair. 'What an actor!' observed the skeptical Gibbon, but even Gibbon did full justice to the quality of the eloquence and spoke of it as a 'display of genius.'

This speech was fully reported and is consequently better known than the previous one, but it must be remembered that in those days reporting was never entirely reliable and that Sheridan did not trouble himself to correct the speech for publication. No quotation can possibly convey the effect of oratory on such a scale. On the fourth day there were 'few dry eyes in the assembly,' and Burke declared that nothing which 'the acuteness of the Bar, the dignity of the Senate, or the morality of the Pulpit' had ever furnished could equal what had been heard that day in Westminster Hall.

After this the interest in the trial waned rapidly. The proceedings dragged on year after year until Sheridan was heard to wish that Hastings would fly the realm with Burke yelping at his heels. In the meanwhile the King went mad and recovered, the French Revolution broke out, and Great Britain went to war with France. The end did not come until 1795, by which time about a third of the peers who had been present at the beginning were dead. Hastings was acquitted on every charge, and in only two did the minority number as many as six. One of these two was the charge on which Sheridan had made his famous speech.

The trial cost Hastings £70,000, and though he was acquitted he was unable to obtain any redress. Public opinion, however, swung in his favor, and something like justice was done at last to his achievements. In 1813, he gave evidence before a committee of the whole House in an enquiry relating to the renewal of the East India Company's charter. He was applauded by both sides and, when he withdrew, the members rose and stood silent in his honor.

By that time Burke, Fox, and Pitt were dead, and Sheridan had ceased to be a Member of Parliament. His fortunate years were over. He had long since been given to excessive drinking; he was heavily in debt and in 1809, his theatre had burned to the ground. The great speech in Westminster Hall marked the highest point in his career, and when he died, in 1816, he was in painfully distressed circumstances; indeed, only the stern representations of the doctor saved him from being carried off in his blankets by the sheriff's officers. Hastings, who was far older and had spent more than a third of his long life in India, survived until 1818. Some years after the trial the two met, and Sheridan, with that charm which few people could resist, went out of his way to assure Hastings that the part he had taken against him had been 'purely political'—on which Hastings dryly observed that he wished Mr. Sheridan would make that statement public.

AMERICAN AND BRITISH DEBATING

Anthony Wedgwood Benn, Sir Edward Boyle, and Kenneth Harris

FOR three young Englishmen a debating tour of American universities is a most stimulating and enjoyable experience. Most important of all, from our point of view, were the many opportunities that the tour afforded us of discussing a variety of topics of current interest and significance with a great number of American students. At the same time we had a splendid chance to study the teaching and organization of debating as it is carried on in the United States. The main points of difference between American and British methods were clearly brought out in the two articles which appeared in the February 1948 issue of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH. We do not wish to repeat those points nor to quarrel with them, but it seems to us that the differences are much more fundamental than might at first appear, and at the risk of generalizing, we should like to emphasize those differences.

1

The value of public speaking and debating is obvious and is accepted equally on both sides of the Atlantic. It is an ancient art that should be maintained. It quickens the mind and stimulates thought. It encourages forcefulness and self-expression and indirectly constitutes a valuable element in training for citizenship with which, in its widest sense, the universities are so vitally concerned. With typical American thoroughness these facts have been recognized, and debating has been accepted as an integral part of the education offered to college students. The result is a highly organized system of teaching which brings with it immense advantages that struck us, as visitors, very forcibly. The cost of providing professors and instructors, books and equipment, is met by the university. Those aspects of debating which can be taught are being taught. For example, stance, gesture, emphasis, the preparation and presentation of material—all these are points on which the freshman can be guided. There are judges to comment upon and criticize actual debating speeches, and the more obvious faults and errors can be located and eradicated.

As a result of all this care and effort the product of the American speech departments is a well-polished speaker. However, this way of managing debate seems to us to have certain inherent disadvantages. Faculty supervision and control tends to focus too much attention on the debater and not enough on the debate. The debate itself may become a performance rather than a productive exchange of views on a subject of compelling interest, and the verdict of the judges, with their emphasis on skill irrespective of topic, goes still further to make this so. In these circumstances it is not surprising that the debates are often ill-attended. Yet in fact, the audience must be more than a group of passive spectators if the debater is to achieve his object: the effective transference of his own opinions to his listeners. He should surely be studying their every reaction, getting them on

The authors represented the Oxford Union Society on a debating tour of the United States and Canada in the winter of 1947-8. Mr. Wedgwood Benn, of New College, was President of the Oxford Union in the summer of 1947; and Sir Edward Boyle, of Christ Church, in the summer of 1948. Mr. Harris has now graduated from Oxford.

his side emotionally as well as intellectually, skipping those parts of any argument on which he feels that they share his view and hammering home the points on which he feels they are least sympathetic. He must really believe what he is saying, or no amount of technical perfection can assist him; and for that reason the practice of speaking on both sides of a motion—except in special circumstances—is surely destructive of the sort of enthusiasm that is infectious. He must put his own individuality into his presentation of the case and recognize the fact that an audience would rather believe a speaker whom they like and feel that they can trust than one who relies on statistics and quotations which, taken out of their context, they may suspect. To this extent then the practice of having a national debate topic for the year —however essential to competitive debating—may legitimately be held to be undesirable.

If then there are any criticisms to be made of American debating methods we suggest that they are along these lines. The subject being debated is often stale and relatively insignificant in the debate; and there is not enough attention paid to audience reaction, nor flexibility allowed in presentation. Of course, we fully recognize that the whole object of American debate training is different from our own and that for this reason direct comparisons are invidious. We ourselves should never dream of referring to a debate as a forensic contest but rather as a political argument or discussion, and those different terms go a long way towards explaining the point that we are attempting to make. Having come up against many championship debaters in the United States we learned a healthy respect for their forensic ability and the skill with which they located and exploited the weak points in our case. By concentrating more closely on the subject rather than on the motion and on the audience rather than on our opponents or the judges we laid ourselves open to the closely argued and forcibly delivered attacks to which we were regularly subjected. The rebuttal speeches were a new and delightful experience for us. They provided an opportunity rarely and inadequately afforded in a British debate of examining the arguments put forward on the other side and of attempting to refute and ridicule them.

The direct clash thus made possible adds a great deal to the value of the debate.

2

At British universities debating is on a wholly different basis. We are really qualified to write only of Oxford and Cambridge—though the general application is much wider—just as the preceding comments can be held to apply closely only to the state universities and not to those places where debating is more or less independent of faculty supervision. The Oxford Union Society was founded in the mid-1820's to 'discuss any subject not immediately involving theological questions,' and this reservation has for obvious reasons persisted up to the present day. The emphasis then was, and still is, on the subjects to be discussed and not upon the training of students to speak in public. The young society, with its small membership, came up against early opposition from the university authorities, but survived these difficulties and slowly grew to its present strength with more than 25,000 members who have been, or still are, at Oxford. The Society now has its own buildings and garden with library, billiard, dining, smoking, and reading rooms—property in all worth nearly a million dollars. This may seem irrelevant to the debating activities as such but, in fact,

it is intimately connected with them. The student president, officers, and committees, elected each term by the resident members, are entirely responsible themselves for the management of the Society; and each weekly debate is preceded by private business when the details of this management are discussed and decided. In fact, some of the finest speeches heard in the House are delivered on subjects of practical administrative importance.

The debate topics themselves are chosen week by week. If Palestine, Western Union, or some piece of Government legislation comes suddenly into the limelight a debate will be arranged to deal with these questions. The motion will be thrown open to the House when the main speeches are over, and anyone may speak if he notifies the President of his wish to do so. At the end of the evening a vote is taken on the motion itself, and the decision of the House is recorded. No attempt at all is made to evaluate the skill of the speakers. Though there are no rebuttals, controversial points or facts in doubt are thrashed out there and then in a sharp exchange between speaker and heckler. The right of interruption is much valued and not infrequently used when we have distinguished visitors addressing the House—which happens two or three times a term. It really is attractive to be able to question, for example, a Cabinet Minister on his policy in the course of his speech; and this full participation of members stimulates great interest and attention. The form of debate is strictly Parliamentary as are the seating arrangements with opposing sides facing each other and speakers on the same floor level as their listeners. A member knows that those sitting behind him are, more or less, his supporters and can direct his verbal attacks to his opponents whom he faces. In this way he is encouraged to be sensitive to audience reactions. The House, which is highly critical and often well-informed, loses no time in making it clear to the dull or pompous speaker how they feel about him; but there is an old tradition of close attention to all that is worth hearing regardless of the unpopularity of the view expressed. Thus, the beginner learns slowly by practice and experience some of the 'do's' and 'don'ts' of debating.

This account will be sufficient to show in which direction the main differences lie. The emphasis in Britain is on the subject rather than on the technique, and with each topic being discussed only once those who wish to improve their technique must do so by speaking at a number of debates of a widely differing nature.

3

But to speak only of the Union Society at Oxford would be to give a very incomplete account of the background of debating. It is essential to refer in passing to the different attitude to politics found on American and British campi. We came across local chapters of the Young Republicans, A. D. A., P. C. A., and so on in the course of our tour, but even so there appeared to be far less political activity than is customary at a British university. Here at Oxford every shade of opinion from Communist through Labour, Liberal, and Tory to Fascist, is organized in clubs that among them include nearly 50 per cent of all students. These clubs each publish their own regular newspaper and hold one big meeting a week when some national figure will come down to speak and to be questioned.

Aside from this a series of keen study groups gather frequently to consider in detail some significant aspect of the domestic or international scene. It is from these young campus politicians that the Oxford Union draws its best-informed

and most competent debaters. There is no doubt but that these extracurricular activities take up a lot of time, but the faculty is the first to recognize their value and make allowances accordingly. There are many explanations offered for this intense interest in politics. No question the fact that our parties are grouped semi-ideologically accounts in part for their peculiarly strong appeal to the young boy or girl straight from school. Moreover nowadays, with the severe economic situation that Britain faces the Government's policies affect our day-to-day lives very intimately; and we are more than ever interested in those policies.

There are then, it can be seen, certain advantages in British debating methods. The activity is organized for undergraduates by undergraduates for the sheer love of debating. Our wholly flippant motions—such as 'That in the opinion of this House, Columbus went too far or 'That this House deserves its doubtful reputation,' both debated this year—are, of course, special examples of this; but at its best the Union encourages a certain lightness of touch at all times which makes even the most serious speeches enjoyable. Moreover, the weekly debates may be said to provide some sort of an education in current affairs; and there is an ever-present platform for all kinds of opinion. Generosity and restraint endear a speaker to the Society, and the scoring of a 'debating point' earns no praise from anyone. There are, of course, grave disadvantages too. The standard of oratory is, by no means, always high and many people—in fact, the majority—would profit immensely by even the most elementary instruction in the art of public speaking. Small 'speakers classes' run by the political clubs under the guidance of some undergraduate who has had some practice do help a bit, and advice is often offered to the beginner by the 'old hand,' but this is not really adequate. The debates are often long and dull, and many late speakers do not bother to modify their notes so as to avoid repeating what has already been said. This fact combined with the absence of rebuttals, may mean that the debate rambles on without achieving the cohesion and clash that is so desirable. Incidentally too, independence from faculty interference means independence from faculty financial assistance; and that has its drawbacks. All our expenses have to be met out of our membership subscriptions; and we cannot afford, for example, the elaborate equipment that we found in the speech departments of some American universities.

4

Those then are our main impressions of the differences between our two ways of teaching and practicing debate. However, far from making international debates difficult or valueless these differences make them more pleasant and more profitable. A West Point team visited Oxford last June (1948) and put up a splendid show which we shall always remember with pleasure. Our own attitude to these exchanges is best brought out by the following motion which proposed, in private business, soon after our return to Oxford:

> That this House wishes to express its heartfelt appreciation and thanks to all those who extended their generous hospitality to the Union debaters during their recent visit to the U. S. A. and Canada; and looks forward to welcoming debating teams from those countries to Oxford in the near future.

It was one of those rare occasions when we were all delighted to give a motion our unanimous support. Even debaters do not always want to debate.

EXTRACURRICULAR DISPUTATIONS: 1400-1650

Bromley Smith

THE writer is tempted to claim that the extracurricular disputations of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries—especially those between rival universities—were the forebears of our modern, intercollegiate debates. Such a claim would doubtless fall into that category of fallacies known as *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. It is, of course, impossible to prove that present-day debates are the offspring of the old-time disputations, whether intramural or extramural. But they are closely related for they are phases of education by argument, and both are current methods of instruction. This study merely aims to exhume the evidence that years ago students enjoyed intellectual warfare outside the regular classroom disputations.

1

In the following passage a historian of Cambridge University calls attention to a disputation held outside of the curriculum: one between champions of his university and a challenging student from Oxford. 'One John Argentyn (of Strasburg), a scholar of Oxford, came and challenged the whole University of Cambridge to dispute with him. This "Scholar-errant" met all the Regents of this University, as Opponents, Anno 1407.'[1] Such exhibitions of dialectic skill were not common in the Renaissance as they are nowadays; nevertheless, they were held occasionally and were welcomed by the students wearied by the regular disputations of the colleges and of the universities. Sometimes these extracurricular exercises were held between rival universities, sometimes between colleges of the same university, sometimes between champions of a school and wandering scholars who, like knights of old, posted challenges and couched their lances in tournaments of the mind.

Earliest of these mental jousts were those mentioned by Peter Abelard in a letter to Heloise: 'I was an emulator of the peripatetics, when I walked through the various provinces and disputed wherever logic flourished.'[2] This was the same Abelard who, after his travels, enrolled in the classes of William of Champeaux at the cathedral school of Notre Dame and who shortly thereafter unhorsed his distinguished teacher in a classroom debate. This particular disputation falls outside the scope of our discussion, however, and will not be examined here; that is, it was *in cursu*.

2

Keeping our focus upon the extracurricular exercise, then, we turn to an intercollegiate disputation held in 1531. In reporting the event Thomas Fuller wrote:

> Two Oxford men, the one George Throgmorton, the other John Ascwell, came to Cambridge, having much learning in their heads (but needing to have brought more in their Port-mantues) challenged all the University of Cambridge to dispute with them on these questions:
>
> 1. Jus Civile sit praestantius Medicina.
> 2. Mulier morti condemnata et bis suspensa, raptis Laqueis, tertio suspendi debeat.
>
> These two thus ordered themselves, that Throgmorton should be *the Forlorn-hope*, and answer first: Ascwell was kept for *the Reserve* to come after him.

BROMLEY SMITH *was formerly Professor of Speech at Bucknell University. He is the author of a translation of Milton's College Declamations and Disputations.*

Fuller continued the account:

> Five Cambridge men undertook the Disputation: viz. John Redman, Nicholas Ridley, John Robesby, Elizens Price, and Griffith Tregarn ... repairing to the schools (the doors wherof were broken open by crowds of People). These *Disputants* so pressed Throgmorton, that finding him to fail, they followed their advantage, to improve the *Foile* into a flat *Fall*, and would never suffer him (mens spirits once cast are easily kept down) to recover himself. Wherefore Ascwell his Partner, who was to answer on the second question, declined it by dissembling himself sick. Who, had he not been sick of a conceited soul, had never come thither on that occasion.
>
> Home go this brace of Disputatants wiser than thay came to Cambridge.... Some have reported that afterwards they were expelled the University for their daring undertaking. One of the opponents in this affair was Ridley, who became the famous bishop. He is said to have administered the *flagella linguae* to one of these pert pretenders to logic lore with such happy effect, that the other was afraid to set his wit upon him.[3]

Another intercollegiate disputation was held apparently the next year 1533 for an order was drawn by the Vice Chancellor to pay the expenses of entertaining Oxonians and those who disputed publicly with them amounting to 6s. 8d. At this exhibition the rivalry must have been keen, otherwise why should orders be drawn to pay the 'carpenters who repaired the doors of the schools broken in disputation of the Oxford men, 13d.'?[4]

3

Although these intercollegiate disputations were rare—probably on account of distances and bad roads—disputations between the several colleges within the walls of a university were frequent; at least, such was the custom at Oxford. Of the Oxford exercises Anthony à Wood observed on April 7, 1666: 'Lent concluded and not one stroke struck in the scooles or any *coursing*.' By coursing he meant the disputations held during the Lenten season at Oxford between champions of the colleges. These exercises frequently turned into fist-fights both in the schools and in the streets of the town. No one knows when this rivalry between the colleges began; it was at its height in the time of Dr. John Fell, Vice Chancellor in 1645, who used his authority to uproot it. His suppression, however, was not permanent; for the practice 'of one party to run down and confute another in disputation'—although commonly ending 'in blows and domestic quarrels (the refuge of the vanquished side)'—was still flourishing in 'Oliver's Time.'[5]

Continuing his account Wood wrote that when the Presbyterians and Independents controlled the University there were 'excellent disputations in the schools and much zealous coursing'; so much so, indeed, that the opponents passed from words to blows while their partisans joined in the fray to the great pleasure of the onlookers of the town and 'to the great scandall of the gowne.' In particular, he noted the coursing between disputants of Christ Church and those of Jesus College. The former were great bread eaters, and the latter—all Welshmen—were exceedingly fond of cheese, circumstances which led some lampooner to compose a little poem commemorating the rivalry:

> Bread and cheese
> For Christ Jees-
> Sus sake.[6]

Wood forebore further quotation from this irreverent doggerel.

One must not judge that the antiquarian was condemning coursing even though it ended 'alwaies in blows.' Far from it! he seemed to regard these intramural contests with approval. Speaking of Dr. Fell's attempt to reform 'the coursing in Lent,' Wood said in 1668: 'that laudable custome in some respects

broken; they are not apt or ready to dispute.' Ten years later he again commented: '180 bachelors this last Lent. . . but no coursing, which is bad.' In 1658 occurred the death of Will George of Christ Church, 'a noted sophister and remarkable *courser* in the time of Lent in the publick schooles.' One gathers from Wood that the battle of intellects within the walls was commendable although the physical demonstrations of prowess were a 'scandall of the gowne.'[7] The testimony of Thomas Hearne of Oxford—to the effect that the custom was not confined to the colleges or streets of the town but was carried on at Aristotle's Well, a resort near Oxford to which the students would repair when 'coursing was in practice'[8]—sustains Wood's report.

The best account of these intramural disputations comes from the *Reminiscences* of Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury, who entered Exeter College, Oxford, in 1637. He shortly became a leader 'of all the rough young men of that college.' Let him tell the story in his own way:

> Of that college, famous for the courage and strength of tall, rawboned Cornish and Devonshire gentlemen, which in great numbers yearly came to that college, and did maintain in the schools *coursing* against Christ Church, the largest and most numerous college in the University. This *Coursing* was in older times, I believe, intended for a fair trial of learning and skill in logic, metaphysics and school divinity; but for some ages that has been the least part of it, the dispute quickly ending in affronts, confusion, and very often blows, when they went most gravely to work. They forebore striking, but making a great noise with their feet, they hissed and shoved with their shoulders, and the stronger in that disorderly order drove the other out before them; and, if the schools were above stairs, with all violence hurrying the contrary party down, the proctors were forced either to give way to their violence or suffer in the throng. Nay, the Vice-Chancellor, though it seldom has begun when he was present, yet being begun, he has sometimes unfortunately been so near as to be called in, and has been overcome in their fury once up in these adventures. I was often one of the disputants, and gave the sign and order for their beginning.[9]

It must have been the violence and the danger of these college disputations that led Archbishop Laud during his Chancellorship of Oxford to stop all coursing. This he did after receiving a letter from the Vice Chancellor during Lent, 1637: 'The students of Christ Church and Exeter grew so unruly the last week, (the masters interposing and wrangling in the schools, and their boys fighting out of school), that I was forced to command an absolute cessation of all menner of disputations betwixt the two houses; and so they rest quiet ever since.'[10]

Laud kept this letter in his active file and wrote in February of the next year:

> I pray take care of Lent, and the disputations in their beginnings, and speak to the heads of the houses at your next meeting, that they may warn their several companies, that they keep disputations at the schools diligently, but very orderly and peacefully. And since I have now by many years experience observed that coursing between one college and another is the great mother of all disorder, and that it is almost impossible to have decent and orderly disputations, if that be permitted; these are to require you, that you suffer no such coursing at all under any pretence. . . . And I pray desire the heads to be very careful that the disputations may be scholar-like and peaceable.[11]

The Archbishop's orders were heeded judging from the report which Accepted Frewen, President of Magdalen (1626-43), made on March 30, 1640: 'Our Lent disputations are now (God be thanked) happily ended, without any the least tumult or disorder at any time.'[12]

4

The definition of *coursing* might be extended from meaning disputations between colleges to meaning disputations between a student of a college and those of the Public Schools—a species of

free-for-all coursing. An incident of this kind is recorded in the school career of William Gouge of King's College, Cambridge. He had become expert in defending the logic of Peter Ramus—that Ramus whose views were expanded into a text by John Milton.[13] Gouge was suddenly called upon to defend his master one day because divers sophisters set out to vilify Ramus:

> The Respondent was given this question: *nunquam erit magnus cui Ramus est magnus.* [Nobody will be great, to whom Ramus is great] Which some of the sophisters hearing, and knowing the said William Gouge to be an active disputant and stiff defender of Ramus, they went to the divinity schools, where he was hearing an Act, and told him how in the other schools they were abusing Ramus. He thereupon went to the sophister's schools, and upon the moderator's calling for another opponent he stepped up and brought such an argument as stumbled the respondent; whereupon the moderator took upon him to answer it, but could not satisfie the doubt. This occasioned a sophister that stood by to say with a loud voice, "Do you come to vilify Ramus, and cannot answer the argument of a Ramist?" Whereupon the moderator rose up and gave him a box on the ear. Then the school was all in an uproar, but the same William Gouge was safely conveyed out from amongst them.[14]

5

These extracurricular disputations occurred also on the continent if we accept the testimony of John Evelyn's *Diary*. Evelyn, who had been a student at Oxford and at Middle Temple, was travelling in France in 1644 when he met a learned Irishman. The Irishman had been a friar in Spain, a reader in Rome, and a disputant everywhere he travelled. Together they visited a Jesuit college where the Hibernian soon entered into a 'very hot dispute on some points in divinity,' which 'points' were not well received by the members. Later they came to the Sorbonne at a moment when a grave Doctor was dictating from his chair to a multitude of auditors.

> After we had sat a little, our cavalier (the Irishman) started up, and rudely enough began to dispute with the Doctor; at which, and especially as he was clad in the Spanish habit, which in Paris is the greatest bug-bear imaginable, the scholars and the Doctor fell into such a fit of laughter, that nobody could be heard speak for a while; but silence being obtained, he began to speak in Latin, and made his apology in so good a style, that their derision was turned to admiration; and beginning to argue, he so baffled the Professor, that with universal applause they all rose up, and did him great honours, waiting on us to the very street and our coach, and testifying great satisfaction.[15]

From the foregoing account of disputations by old-time college men it is evident that the itch for argumentative collisions is not a modern phenomenon. Indeed, the men of the Renaissance seemed to have swallowed and digested the saying of Pierre le Chantre, that 'Nothing is perfectly known unless it has been crushed by the tooth of disputation.'[16]

1 Thomas Fuller, *History of the University of Cambridge,* ed. Nichols (London, 1840) 64.
2 Pierre Abailard, *Opera,* ed. Cousin (Paris, 1849-59) 1.14.
3 Fuller, *History* 154. Also *Facetiae Cantabrigiensis* (London, 1825) 71.
4 Grace Book B (Cambridge, 1903-05) 2.174.
5 Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxoniensis* (London, 1691) 2.796.
6 Anthony à Wood, *The life and times of Anthony Wood, antiquary of Oxford* (Collected ... by Andrew Clark and printed for the Oxford Historical Society by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1891-1900, in five volumes) 2.75 fn.
7 Ibid. 2.83, 129, 402.
8 Thomas Hearne, *Reliquiae Hearnianae* (Oxford, 1703) 2.65.
9 Shaftesbury, First Earl of, Anthony A. Cooper, *Memoirs, Letters and Speeches,* ed. by W. D. Christie (London, 1859) I, App. I, c.xi.
10 William Laud, *Works* (Oxford, 1847) 5.191.
11 Ibid. 5.217.
12 Ibid. 5.267.
13 John Milton, *Artis logicae plenior institutio, ad Petri Rami methodum concinnata* (London, 1672); in *The Works of John Milton* (Columbia University Edition), ed. and tr. by Allan H. Gilbert (New York, 1935) vol. 11.
14 Samuel Clarke, *Lives of Thirty-two English Divines* (London, 1670) 235.
15 *Diary of John Evelyn,* ed. by Henry B. Wheatley, 4 vols. (London, 1906) 1.50.
16 *Verbum Abbreviatum* in Migne, Patrologiae Latina 205, cap. 1.2.

NOTES FOR AN IMAGINED ANTHOLOGY

Carl E. Burklund

AMONG the illusions that every teacher must live by, none, perhaps, is more comforting than this: that some time—so help him!—he will do the definitive text in his field. If his interest is poetry and its oral interpretation his resolution may be especially firm for he will examine anthology after anthology designed for such a purpose and shake his head: this may be 'fair' indeed, and 'that bra',' but they are far from the text he desires or—so help him!—the one that he could do if he had a mind.

1

My case is not quite identical for I do not have a class in oral interpretation; but of the perfect anthology, at any rate, I have long dreamed. And here in outline is its character and its contour.

To begin with, two simple premises would underlie its creation and use: first, and most important, there would be no compromise—intentionally—with quality. Every poem included would, to the best of my judgment, be at least good—nay, excellent. The anthology would be frankly highbrow on the defensible thesis that properly handled the best poetry is also the most appealing, even to the uninitiate. Shakespeare wins hands down over Eddie Guest any and every time. The thesis that only the good is good enough seems an obvious one, but even a casual survey of texts makes clear that for one reason or another this thesis is by no means universal.

CARL E. BURKLUND *is Professor of English in the College of Engineering at the University of Michigan. He is the author of more than a hundred poems published in a score of magazines including* Poetry, The Sewanee Review, The Golden Book, *and* The Virginia Quarterly.

A second premise, no less charmingly simple, would govern its use: namely, that the sole objective of the course would be to teach students to read poetry well—a statement by no means as self-evident as it appears. Poetry is an art; so is its oral presentation. Learning to read poetry well, therefore, is learning to interpret an art with the sureness and the grace of an artist. Theoretically, it is learning to bring out with richness and discrimination all that the poet has put into the poem: its formal beauty, its depth, its nuance of emotion, its rhythm, its opulence or distinction of language, its melody, its deliberate and its incidental meanings. These *are* the poem, and ideally—though seldom, perhaps, reached in practice—the oral projection should be its equivalent permitting the listener that moment of perfect joy when he feels that all that is organically tensed in the poem has found fulfillment, release. Deep has spoken unto deep—and there is nothing more to be said.

Having set forth the two simple principles that would govern the creation of our perfect anthology let us examine its imagined text. Briefly, it would include two kinds of material: critical exposition and a collection of poems.

The first part of the book—perhaps several chapters—would be devoted to an analysis of poetry as an art structure. The reason is simple enough: in order to read poetry well one must know poetry well—how it is put together, the qualities and functions of its principal elements. How else can one read with the authority of the artist? On the assumption that this need is often over-

looked or minimized I should discuss with illustrative material four matters in poetry: form, verbal rhythm, imagery, and melody. Each of these would be analyzed; and its contributions to the poem made clear. But since the study of poetry as an art form is in this case only a means to an end I should in a second section of the book deal with certain general and certain specific problems in the art of reading poetry.

On the first matter the essence of the discussion would be something like the following. The constant problem in the reading of poetry is how to achieve an acceptable ratio between poetry as 'art' and poetry as 'life'; that is, how to be faithful simultaneously to the ideal demands of the poem and to the everyday demands of the average listener. A reader may in various ways fail to achieve this ratio. He may be no more than technically loyal to the poem, rendering with mechanical accuracy—and dullness—what is given in rhythm, melody, and implied inflections. He may be too aesthetically loyal to the poem, transforming it into a stylized chant. Or—to mention at least one other possibility—he may be too concessive to the everyday human world and so reduce to an informative expression what was conceived as an art expression. The goal, it would be suggested, is to preserve the art pattern but within its framework to impose the modulations of a life rhythm—that of the reader—with its small surprises, its unexpected shifts in tempo, in emphasis, and in pitch. This would make the poem as alive as ordinary speech but speech at an extraordinary level of intensity, perfection of form, and beauty. The specific problems facing the reader are so many that it is impossible to do more than suggest their nature. Most of them, in one fashion or another, relate to imagery, rhythm, and melody. Here, I should offer some observations of which the following are merely illustrative.

Imagery is of the three probably easiest for the reader to manage for, more directly than either of the other elements, it is the vehicle of thought. A clear reading will meet, at least, the minimum requirement: that of permitting the listener to see and, hence, to feel. But the minimum, of course, is never quite enough: images differ in character, in sharpness, in freshness, and in 'feel.' One cannot offer Ogden Nash as one would offer Lear's apostrophe to the storm; the slender brilliance of Suckling as one would the majesty of Milton. It is obvious that the quality of the voice and that the degree of lightness or intensity, of solemnity or passion, appropriate to the image must bring out and reinforce its inherent nature.

Far more difficult are the problems faced in verbal rhythm. As it is the most persuasive element in verse so it is also the most decisive. Nothing can more easily ruin a fine poem or more easily make tolerable a mediocre one than the handling of rhythm. Aside from the constant issue it thrusts upon the reader—how clearly to project and yet not overdo the special design of any poem—there are many lesser issues that grow out of the refinements of rhythm as employed in all its infinite possibilities.

There are, for example, many forms of irregularity in stress and tempo which often give to a poem or a passage its peculiar strength: sudden retardings or sudden accelerations of movement, purposive awkwardness, broken or highly irregular meter. As an easy illustration of the first we have this stanza from Keats's La Belle Dame Sans Merci:

> O what can ail thee knight at arms,
> Alone and palely loitering?
> The sedge is wither'd from the lake,
> And no birds sing.

If one were fool enough he *could* make

that last line iambic and so completely vitiate the reading. Nothing less than some degree of stress on every word in the line and a general slowing down of tempo is adequate. A subtler example is found in Emily Dickinson's A Cemetery:

> This quiet Dust was Gentlemen and Ladies,
> And Lads and Girls.

Theoretically, this couplet might be scanned as iambic, but a good reading will probably give unusual stress to *Gentle—, Ladies, Lads, Girls,* and slow down at least the second line and possibly the second half of the first line as well.

Somewhat different in character from enforced shifts of this kind is what one may call purposive awkwardness, a technique of the poet to force the accent on unexpected syllables in order to secure certain effects; when successful, very lovely indeed. The second of these two lines from Hopkins' Heaven-Haven will illustrate:

> I have desired to go
> Where springs not fail.

The necessity of giving minor—better, major—accent to *not* lends to this passage a singular emphasis. De la Mare's exquisite Epitaph reveals the same technique as witness the first four lines:

> Here lies a most beautiful lady;
> Light of step and heart was she;
> I think she was the most beautiful lady
> That ever was in the West Country.

Erratic meter often, almost more than the language, creates the dramatic flavor or sense of a passage. That this be not lost in the reading requires a sharp awareness of stress and tempo. The stumbling, rough movement of these lines from one of Browning's Cavalier Tunes is in itself a perfect statement of the unlettered heartiness of the cavalier who sings them:

> To whom used my boy George quaff else,
> By the old fool's side that begot him?

The first line—perhaps also the second—requires a preposterous number of accents to bring out its full quality. No less does the power of Rossetti's Woodspurge depend on a change in tempo, almost from line to line:

> The wind flapped loose, the wind was still,
> Shaken out dead from tree and hill:
> I had walked on at the wind's will,—
> I sat now, for the wind was still.

The special problems offered for study by the intricacies of rhythm are interesting and endless. No less fascinating are those encountered in melody. Although open to analysis in its simpler constituents melody in its organic form is almost beyond the reach of examination. Only a few of its subtleties may be here suggested. Take, to begin with, this excerpt from Leonie Adams' Ghostly Trees:

> O beech, unbind your yellow leaf, for deep
> The honeyed time lies sleeping, and lead shade
> Seals up the eyelids of its golden sleep.

Although other elements contribute as well—especially alliteration in both pure and oblique form—note that it is the assonated *e* and to a lesser degree the assonated long *i* that contrive much of the rich music of these lines. A reading that does not quietly but effectively underline this assonance must inevitably fail.

Consider, further, the vowel pattern in this excerpt from Collins' Ode to Evening:

> If aught of oaten stop, or pastoral song
> May hope, chaste Eve, to soothe thy modest ear.

The melodic appeal of this marvellous couplet depends largely upon its sequence of long, open vowels. Failure to make this evident by the voice will destroy both the immediate beauty of the lines and much of their inherent meaning, for the slow, rich vowels are symbolic of the spacious tranquillity of evening.

And, finally, from Miss Millay's

Elegy, a couplet especially complex in its melody:

> There will be rose and rhododendron
> When you are dead and underground.

A few comments must here suffice. The passage makes heavy use of the liquid consonants *r* and *n*. Alliteration of the *r* and *d* in both direct and indirect forms is pronounced. Assonance, with its implicit suggestion of rhyme, is particularly strong: *rose, rhodo—, there, den—, when, dead, —dron,* and *un—*. A sort of transliterated rhyme is heard in *—dendron* and *under*. There is implied a balanced melodic theme rising to statement in the first line and falling to solution in the second, with a final shift in *—ground* to a new vowel or diphthong value that seems to the ear to close the theme vigorously. These are the simple melodic elements of the passage woven into complex design; their combined claims must be recognized in any artistic reading.

The foregoing is only a sketch of what, I believe, should go into the expository part of the imagined anthology. Indispensable, certainly, is instruction in the rationale of reading; but equally indispensable, it would seem to me, is an adequate discussion of the structure and the technique of poetry. Oral interpretation is a great art; so is poetry. Excellence in performance predicates a sensitive understanding of both. With this brief restatement of premise let us turn to the anthology itself.

2

An anthology is organized on two principles: it has an underlying purpose in its creation and a scheme to impose order on its contents. An anthologist may intend to offer the best verse of an age or of a nation and may arrange his selections according to theme, chronology, or alphabetical sequence of poets. Or he may intend to celebrate rural delights and group his poems according to subjects or to seasons. The combinations are almost endless.

The purpose behind my imagined anthology would be to help the student master the fine art of reading poetry. Certain consequences follow: first of all, the selections would be made with the student—the embryo artist—in mind, not his presumed listeners. Hence, I should blandly disregard all data on the popularity appeal of poems and on audience response. In the second place, since, in any re-creative art, talent is fostered by a study not of the inferior but of the best, the selections would never—intentionally—be a concession to mediocrity; there would be no 'mother, home, and heaven' verse, no common sense tied with a ribbon. Finally, since mastery in presentation implies competence over a wide variety of material the anthology would be as representative as possible.

Specifically, the contents would be organized into three divisions, symbolic of three different 'cuts' through poetry: types of poetic structure, modes of expression, and moods expressed. The divisions would, no doubt, overlap; and the classification in part be arbitrary; but the range would be liberal.

The direct aim of the first section would be to acquaint the student with the chief varieties of poetic form, determined mainly by rhythm and rhyme. It would, hence, include poems from three categories: conventional, blank, and free verse. Under the conventional verse there would, of course, be samples of the dominant meters, so familiar that they need not here be illustrated. There would be offered, in addition, a number of poems of odd or irregular meter, such as Shelley's Dirge and Browning's King Charles and Who'll Do Him Right Now?; and—more important—samples

of famous rhythms almost *sui generis*: Christabel, the poems of Hopkins; Lepanto, of Chesterton; and Love in a Valley, of Meredith. These pose wellnigh special problems in reading. And as with rhythm so would rhyme be illustrated both in its standard forms and in some of its experiments—those intriguing experiments in analyzed, slanted, or approximate rhyme of Frank Kendon, Wilfred Owen, and MacLeish, to mention but several names. Finally, there would be specimens of such imported patterns as the terza rima, the triolet, the ballade, and the villanelle. For the French forms we might select from Austin Dobson, Andrew Lang, Swinburne, Oscar Wilde—the lovely villanelle, O Singer of Persephone!—and scores of other poets. The terza rima could be beautifully shown by either Shelley's Ode to the West Wind or Frost's I Have Been One Acquainted With the Night.

The specimens of blank verse would exemplify the progressive shift in temper and style from the heroic of the Elizabethans through the still sublime but more subdued verse of Blake and Wordsworth to the familiar in tone of Crabbe, and especially of Robert Frost. Free verse would be accorded a similar representation: from the relatively strict cadences of Arnold's Philomela or Henley's London Voluntaries to the expansive freedom of Whitman, the nervous discontinuities of Fearing, and—perhaps the end of the road—the near prose of Masters. I should add, in parenthesis, that the differences between *types* of poetry—i.e., lyric, narrative, and dramatic—would be adequately shown in the poems illustrating differences in poetic structures itself.

A second division of the anthology would represent a 'cut' through poetry from another perspective, unfortunately not so clean as the preceding but, I think, sound. Its purpose would be to acquaint the student with certain major modes, or perhaps styles, of expression. A good deal of very great poetry is extremely simple in structure, tone, and statement—life seen clearly, stated simply. And a good deal of very great poetry has a rareness of vision, an ecstasy of phrase and movement, that sweep the reader along in hypnotic wonder. The division suggests, very roughly, the classical and the romantic as modes of expression—symbols finally of polarities within ourselves. They call for different psychological sets in the reading, with the first probably more difficult to present than the second. There are, of course, gradations in each; and there are combinations of the two. Wallace Stevens, for instance, has not a little of the *Weltschmerz* of the romantic—fastidiously concealed—and much of the considered form of the classicist; Frost, on the other hand, has much of the restrained vision of the classicist with the easy informality of the romantic. The two modes correspond, substantially, to the major ways in which both we and the poets assess and state experience; in their pure and combined forms we should be able to illustrate the principal differences, and now not in form, but in the spirit of poetry.

From the host of available poems in the first class we might choose such specimens of the simple and direct as Waller's Go, Lovely Rose, Herbert's Virtue —'Sweet day, so cool, so calm, so bright' —Cory's Heraclitus, and Campbell's The Old Woman. From the wide treasury of the second we might select from Shakespeare's sonnets, Browning's There's a Woman Like the Dewdrop, Keats's Ode to a Nightingale, Whitman's apostrophe to the summer night in A Song of Myself, and Swinburne's chorus, 'When the hounds of spring are on winter's traces.'

The first two sections propose a classi-

fication of poetry on the basis of aesthetic form and spirit. But poems grow out of and reveal specific moods—gaiety, sorrow, passion, despair, and a thousand others. The third, and final, division of the anthology would, therefore, try to record something of this range and would suggest to the student an immediate problem: how to render artistically poems so diverse in temper, say, as Shirley's The Glory of Our Blood and State and Ogden Nash's The Mind of Professor Primrose. The selections in this group would vary in mood from the grave to the frivolous, from the joyous to the melancholy, from the didactic to the 'pure' poetry so admired by George Moore, from the candidly philosophic to the tone poems of the Symbolists.

We shall illustrate here possible selections for only a few of these categories. For light verse of many kinds we might choose from Praed, Locker-Lampson, Dobson, Holmes, Dorothy Parker, and Ogden Nash. Reflective verse could be illustrated by Donne's sonnet on Death, Frost's Fire and Ice, and Arnold's Dover Beach; the joyous by Herrick's Corrinna's Going a-Maying, Shelley's Skylark, and Christina Rossetti's A Birthday; the tragic and macabre by Mangan's The Nameless One, Poe's Ulalume, Thomson's City of Dreadful Night, and Jeffers' Ante Morten; 'pure' and tone poetry by selections from De la Mare, Conrad Aiken, Poe, and Coleridge.

With the selections made there would be but one task remaining to conclude the text: to append to each section notes and queries on the poems—when and if these might be genuinely helpful to the student. And with this the anthology would be complete.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF BASIC ENGLISH IN THE UNITED STATES

Tom Burns Haber

THIS survey of the present status of Basic English in the United States is an interim report. According to information received by the writer from Professor I. A. Richards a survey of the status of Basic English in American education will be made presumably in the near future by a representative of the Basic English Foundation in London to be appointed by Mr. C. K. Ogden, one of the co-founders of the system.

There was very little general knowledge of Basic English on this side of the Atlantic before Prime Minister Winston Churchill in his address at Harvard on September 6, 1943, spoke of it in terms of such high praise that for months thereafter no reputable magazine editor could feel comfortable unless his news copy contained something on this 'language within a language.' It is not surprising that after the Churchill address Americans, worshippers of efficiency and streamlining, looked with more than passing interest upon Basic English. It has 850 key words, of which six hundred are nouns, and of these, two hundred may be taught by means of pictures. There are 150 adjectives, and —most important—only eighteen verbs. These latter, with twenty-some prepositions, entering into various combinations with the Basic nouns—three hundred of which take the endings *-ing*, *-ed*, and *-er*—are capable of expressing the meanings of ordinary English usage. It is the selected vocabulary of Basic English that makes it the efficient servant it is in providing the foreign-born with an easy approach to full English. The student of Basic must learn the complete conjugations of the eighteen verbs and the inflected forms of the pronouns. In Basic grammar there is nothing he will have to unlearn as he advances into further acquaintance with the language. 'If a sentence is not good English, it is not good Basic.' A casual reader can absorb paragraph after paragraph of Basic English without being aware of the restricted vocabulary. Basic English has one prime objective: to serve as a means of communication among people of all tongues. It is a means to break down the glass curtain that separates men of different nations and different speech.

Five years ago however, few persons in this country were aware that for a decade a small group of forward-looking teachers had been forging Basic English into an important instrument in American education. The pioneer in this movement—still active, fortunately —was Miss Mary L. Guyton, who was inspired by hearing of the success of I. A. Richards in the teaching of Basic English in China. There was a possibility that the methods which had for some years been effective in the Orient might be transplanted in English classes in the State of Massachusetts, where Miss Guyton was in charge of Adult Civic Education. Determined to seek information at its source, she with Miss Anna Kelley, Supervisor of Adult Education in Peabody, Massachusetts, in 1933 went to the London Orthological

TOM BURNS HABER *is Instructor in English at Ohio State University and author of* A Handbook of Basic English *(Appleton, New York, 1945).*

Institute and studied the system under Mr. Ogden himself.

Miss Guyton's Boston office became the semi-official headquarters for Basic English in America. She at once entered into collaboration with other teachers and supervisors of English; and through the conjoint efforts of Mrs. Helen S. Shears of the Americanization School in Washington, D. C., and many other interested persons, chiefly in the eastern states, Miss Guyton built a firm foundation of techniques and materials adapted to fit the needs of our schools. From the first she has worked closely with the Language Research Institute at Harvard, and under the eye of I. A. Richards and his associates. The original area of classroom experiment was adult or remedial education; and in its later development the teaching of Basic English in this country has produced its best results in the instruction of the adult foreign-born within our gates. As a social instrument, therefore, Basic English has great potentialities, and its contribution is now beginning to be generally recognized.

One of the many tangible results of Miss Guyton's study and collaboration is the three-volume set of booklets, *Learning the English Language* (Houghton Mifflin, 1942-3). It is a fair assumption that a chance visitor in a school where Basic English is being taught will find that the students have made or are making these books their footbridge into English. They were extensively used during the war in the various Relocation Centers throughout our country and are now main texts in first-step English courses offered in the Massachusetts Adult Education program; in the Naturalization Council of Kansas City; in the Adult Education courses of the City of Chicago; and in the Lawton Institute of Linguistics at Los Angeles—to mention a few among many. It should be said in passing that the Teacher's Guide that accompanies *Learning the English Language* explicitly and implicitly relies on phonetic methods in the early teaching of vocabulary and sentence structure. 'The sound of the word or phrase, the sight of the person saying it, and the understanding of the thing or situation which it describes are equally important.'[1]

In order to determine the actual status of the teaching of Basic in the United States today the writer has attempted a survey of the field. Excerpts from letters and reports selected from his correspondence during the past year describe in some detail the progress made. The first quotation is from a reply by Mrs. Maynor Brock, Supervisor of the Kansas City Naturalization Council:

> We appreciate your inquiry into our program of Basic English which we have used now for six years in teaching the foreign-born. We have used the materials published by the Language Research Institute at Harvard. . . . We feel that for exercises and more repetition we must depend upon the ingeniousness of the teacher to get the best results. We have the Anglophone recordings, and we find them very useful because we have the Pocket Book edition of Basic to use when we have the records. Ordinarily we use *Learning the English Language* and the accompanying workbook as our main text. We use Book 4 in mimeograph form, along with *The History of the United States,* also in mimeograph . . . and others supplied us by the Harvard publishers.

From Miss Mildred Wright, Evanston, Illinois:

> As to the Finnish Center, I have twenty-four enrolled now for English and Citizenship. . . . I have had about one hundred students of Basic since November, 1944. People of any nationality may come to the Finnish Community Center. Those there now are chiefly Finnish, German, Swiss, Swedish, and Yugoslavian; and most of them are over forty.
>
> In addition to the regular evening high schools in Chicago in connection with Adult Education work, there are about fifty teachers of foreign people in the Adult Education classes. While Miss Frances Wetmore was still the Chicago Supervisor, Miss Mary Guyton came to

Chicago and gave a two weeks' course in Basic in January, 1944; and her group came out to visit my demonstration class. Consequently some of these teachers use some of the Basic methods. I was at an advantage, as that was the only method I knew to teach foreign people, and it worked. . . .

From Mrs. Margaret L. Emmons, Acting Director of the Orientation Center, Washington, D. C.:

At present Mrs. Helen S. Shears is using the Anglophone records and related work books. Her class averages about six students who stay in it about six weeks before being promoted to an intermediate group, which is using an expanded vocabulary. By that time, new students have entered who start in the Basic Class, which is used for remedial work as well as for beginning students.

During the war years Mrs. Shears, Miss Mildred Wright, Mrs. Etta F. McKinley, Mrs. Ellen Judson, and I all taught Basic at various times, as we were working with a large number of military officers from Latin America who had never studied English before coming to us.

From Vernon Bowyer, Director of Adult Education, Chicago:

Many of our teachers have been making use of the Basic English system for the past few years, and have found it of great value in the teaching of functional, practical English. In general, we believe this system of teaching English to new arrivals to our country is the best approach yet devised.

The books, *Learning the English Language* I, II, and III, are the texts around which our teachers build their Basic English lessons. They have found the teachers' suggestions a great help in presenting the thirty graded steps.

In addition, some of our teachers have found Basic English helpful in remedial work with older residents who wish to improve their English.

From Reed Lawton, of the Lawton School of Linguistics, at Los Angeles:

Although we have borrowed ideas and concepts from the Basic English since this school began in April, 1947, we have just begun to use Basic textbooks. We have been using the *Learning the English Language* series in all our classes in 1948. . . . I first took up Basic in earnest after returning from Japan in 1946. While teaching night classes at the Imperial University in Tokyo I was impressed by the knowledge of English grammar and the thorough training in an extensive vocabulary evident among the students and professors alike. But, even after eight to ten years of study, almost without exception, those Japanese could not understand even the most simple sentences as uttered in normal American conversation. . . . After investigation, I decided that most of this difficulty resolved into these two problems: 1. Although the students had a knowledge of phonetics, they had not been drilled in producing those sounds or in applying them to actual speech situations. This was due partly to the lack of native English speakers and the resultant imperfect pronunciations of the British-trained Japanese professors. 2. True, the knowledge of grammar left little to be desired, but they didn't know how to utilize their academic training. Actually they had been exposed to too much and had been taught nothing. . . . This problem was then something I could not meet very well. Since I have been working with Basic English, I have come to believe that the Basic system is the answer to that problem. . . .

From Albert W. Upton, Whittier College, Whittier, California:

Here at Whittier we have used Basic since 1936 as an instrument of semantic discipline in our compulsory freshman course. About two thousand students have taken the work, and about fifty candidates for the General Secondary Certificate have assisted in teaching them. . . . Professor Charles W. Cooper of our Department has used Basic for several years in much the same way as Rossiter. I have also made use of Basic translation in a summer course for teachers and advanced students. . . . The establishment of the orthological discipline with its attendant use of Basic has been a continuous, and at times disheartening, struggle; but as I have boasted in my *Design for Thinking*, "the effect upon even the most unwilling was impressive. The results with the conscientious were beyond dispute."

From Charles W. Cooper:

I can't add much to what Dr. Upton has already written you, for my use of Basic is incidental to my teaching of literature in my Introduction to Poetry course. You may have noted my Basic English paraphrases in *Preface to Poetry*. . . . This summer I am to teach a couple of courses at Harvard. I plan to use *Learning Basic English*, by Richards and Gibson, as one of the texts in the course, which is called The Teaching of Interpretation and Composition. . . . Personally I find occasional composition in and translation into Basic English a stimu-

lating and profitable exercise. I have on two occasions recently delivered lectures in Basic as demonstrations of its use.

From Winthrop Tilley, of the University of Connecticut, whose *Basic English for College Freshmen* (Farrar & Rinehart, 1941) was a pioneer in its special field:

I have had an elective course here under the title Basic English and Its Applications. . . . In the fall its title will be changed to Introduction to Semantics. It will still make a very considerable use of Basic as a tool, though there will be rather more general reading than previously.

This last winter I gave an extension course in Basic English and Its Applications, under the auspices of the Willimantic State Teachers' College, in Norwich, Connecticut. This was taken by a group of about 25 elementary and secondary school teachers, mostly elementary. My impression is that this course was quite successful. I used *Learning Basic English* as a text.

Harold B. Dunkel, now of the University of Chicago, in 1945 investigated the results of the use of Basic English in adult English classes in the Evening Schools of New York City during the school year 1944-5. His report showed the superiority of Basic English methods over others employed in the controlled experiment. Reporting from this same field, Perry L. Schneider, Assistant Director of the Adult Education Section of the New York City Division of Community Education, informs me that: 'We are using Basic English with some success with literate foreign-born adults and older children. We use Basic English in our evening schools for adults, and it is also used with some modification in classes of children recently arrived from Puerto Rico.'

From Miss Mary L. Guyton, of the Massachusetts Department of Education:

For about 7 or 8 years a course has been offered which I have organized and conducted at the Hyannis State Teachers' College. We have also had a correspondence course in Basic English. . . . In our regular course in Problems and Procedures of Adult Civic Education we incorporate the system of Basic English when we are taking the block of work on teaching-methods and techniques for developing English as a foreign language. . . . Miss Kielty is a supervisor of adult education in the city of Fitchburg, Mass., working under my direction in the State Department of Education. For several summers, I have been able to obtain a small fund and have used this in asking her to assist at the Hyannis summer session in presenting materials and demonstrating class work. She also worked on materials when we were doing research with Professor I. A. Richards. . . . The Basic English teaching in our classes is based primarily on Books 1, 2, and 3 *Learning the English Language* and the Pocket Book of Basic English, with the accompanying records prepared by the Orthological Institute, and a book on Basic English for adult illiterates called *From Words to Stories.*

The Hyannis Summer Bulletin describes Miss Guyton's course in these terms:

This course gives an analysis of the 850-word vocabulary of Basic English. It traces the development of and use of the system of Basic English as an international language, and presents a clear interpretation of the underlying principles of the system. It brings out its adaptation in classes for the adult foreign-born and makes a study of how the system may be used as a check for better English structure in elementary and secondary education. It includes reports on the advancement of Basic English in America and throughout the world. New lesson materials, Basic English charts, and the new series of books, *Learning the English Language*, and other classroom materials are available for study. There will also be opportunity to observe their use in demonstration teaching.

The correspondence course mentioned by Miss Guyton consists of sixteen lessons. It is intended for those whose native tongue is English and especially for teachers who are being trained to direct the foreign-born in the study of English.

From these letters and reports, it is apparent that activity in Basic English in this country is being carried forward on two fronts: first and most typically in orientation centers, where a majority of the students are foreign-born; and sec-

ond, in language departments in American universities and colleges. The close co-operation of the workers in these two fields has produced results that have put the usefulness of Basic English well above dispute. While some critics still continue to express skepticism as to the content or methods of Basic, hundreds of teachers in dozens of our larger American cities are going about the business of making it work, none the worse—if their efforts may be judged by their results—for not attending greatly to the phonemes and 'language streams' so dear to the heart of the professional linguist. The contribution of these teachers to the great and pressing task of the spiritual naturalization of our citizens from overseas is inestimable.

The principal service of the universities is to direct and evaluate: to produce texts and other teaching aids and, above all, to produce teachers. Headquarters for this activity is the Language Research Institute at Harvard University under the directorship of I. A. Richards. Another of their services, branching in a different direction, is to introduce college students to the valuable disciplines in thinking and writing which Basic English uniquely can foster. This was and is the prime aim of Professor Winthrop Tilley, and the trails he blazed are now being followed by many, as some of the letters quoted above have shown. Their cause is identical with that of the thinker Tarrou in Albert Camus's remarkable new novel *The Plague,* who speaks the book's thesis: 'I had come to realize that all our troubles spring from our failure to use plain, clear-cut language.'

Margaret M. Bryant once remarked regretfully to me of Basic: 'All the linguists I know are against it.' Most of us would probably share Miss Bryant's viewpoint, but Basic English is no longer on the defensive. The need 'to use plain, clear-cut language' is now not a learned objective but a practical necessity for living in the atomic age. Many events have occurred within the past few months to shorten the distance between the man in the ivy tower and the man in the street. Distrust on one hand and ignorance on the other are beginning to retreat as the serviceability of Basic English is being generally proved. It is also to the well-being of both sides that some of the rather captious, heavy-handed partisanship that attended the introduction of Basic English in this country is being laid aside and forgotten. Opponents and proponents have something to learn from the examples of such nonpartisans as Professor Gairdner B. Moment, of Goucher College, who has been quietly writing scientific articles and reviews in Basic for over fifteen years.

Barnes & Noble, the principal outlet for Basic publications in this country, list 130 different titles of books in and about Basic English.[2] During the war the demand for Basic texts far exceeded the supply, and many titles went out of print. The market in Basic English dictionaries, translations, and handbooks even now is far from overstocked, the supply of many important texts still lagging behind the demand. Among translations one of the most-wanted Basic books is the complete Bible, of which the New Testament portion has been available since early in 1943. One publisher's agent writes me that, in addition to the circulation in the United States, the Basic books of his company are having a wide distribution in Canada and South America. 'I think it is safe to say that interest in Basic English is growing both in this country and elsewhere,' he sums up.

It may be remarked in conclusion that the premier appearance of a book of poems in Basic English has been recently noted, *A Given Measure* by one

David Hudson. The methods and objectives of Basic English are about as far from those of poetry as can be reasonably imagined; and it is not likely that Mr. Hudson's book will be of great service on either side. But it is a feather in the wind.

From no more evidence than that gained from the survey for this article, it seems evident to at least one observer that the time is ripe for the organization of a national institute of Basic English in this country, comparable in its services to the Basic English Foundation in London. Too many teachers and students of Basic in the United States are unaware of what is being done to expedite and promote their work. Among the first projects that might be undertaken by the American Basic English Foundation would be the following:

1. A directory of educational institutions where Basic English is being taught.

2. A directory of persons active in the field: supervisors, teachers, writers.

3. A comprehensive bibliography of the articles on Basic English that have appeared in American periodicals.

Later developments would include the founding of a national organ, annual conventions, and other similar projects that would unify and make more generally accessible the benefits of experience in widely scattered fields. The eminently practical aims of Basic English and the record which it has already achieved should plead strongly in its favor when means are being considered to obtain funds to launch the initial projects of a national organization.

[1] Page xii.

[2] Of especial interest to the teacher of speech are the *Basic Phonetic Reader* by A. Lloyd James and *Sounds and Forms of Basic English* by J. Rantz. A recent publication of the Quality Press is *Basic English: How to Speak It* by Ernest Esdaile.

SPEECH AT THE MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES
SPEECH INSTRUCTION AT WEST POINT

William J. Thompson

INSTRUCTION in speech has been an integral part of the curriculum at the United States Military Academy for many years. The necessity for an officer of the United States Army or Air Force to be able to communicate his ideas orally needs no detailed justification. A large part of an officer's time is devoted to training and instructing troops, duties which require a firsthand, detailed knowledge of the informational and teaching techniques of speech. In war the development of a citizen's army and air force demands officers who can accommodate peacetime instructional methods to the acceleration of war and who can influence through speech the minds of citizen soldiers and airmen toward the goals imposed by war. Both in peace and in war the Army officer must be able to speak effectively in presenting his views to his superiors and to the general public.

At West Point the cadet receives his first public speaking instruction in the Fourth Class (first year) course conducted by the Department of English. The teaching of oral and written communication is carried on concurrently with roughly fifty per cent of the available time devoted to each. Clarity, correctness, logic, and forcefulness are established as standards for both mediums. In the speech course the keynotes are set by the title of the course, Speech-Making, and by the definition, 'Extended conversation with a purpose.' Speech-Making is stressed as a title because from the very beginning of the speech course emphasis is placed not only upon effective delivery, but, more important, upon making—that is, *constructing*—a speech with a definite purpose and a particular audience always in mind. The cadet is taught that the triangular relationship between the speaker, audience (occasion), and subject must be resolved to achieve an integration toward a definite, specific purpose.

The keynote, 'Extended conversation with a purpose,' places twin stress upon purpose, or motive, and upon dignified informality of delivery—the ease, directness, naturalness, and sincerity of effective conversation extended to a particular audience. The distinctive West Point system of small groups of students —twelve to fifteen for each instructor— furthers this aim and permits frequent speeches by each cadet.

During the year each cadet prepares and delivers to his class group, speeches of all the various types—to inform, to stimulate, to convince, to actuate, to entertain. All these speeches are prepared outside of class for delivery extemporaneously; that is, the cadet is required to have the structure and the material of his speech firmly in mind and to practice his delivery so that he can speak without references other than brief notes. As he progresses the use of notes is discouraged and finally prohibited in short speeches. From time to time without previous warning cadets are assigned impromptu speeches upon subjects with which they have ample acquaintance to give experience in speaking without advance preparation.

COLONEL WILLIAM J. THOMPSON *is Associate Professor of English and Executive Officer of the Department of English at the United States Military Academy.*

Subject matter for extemporaneous speeches prepared outside of class is never assigned. Each cadet selects his own topic from his experience or his knowledge. The only general requirements are that the topic must lend itself to the assigned general end for that particular speech—informative, persuasive, etc.—and that the cadet must be capable of adapting it to the actual cadet audience or to an assumed audience and occasion which the class will represent. In this way the cadet is encouraged and aided to meet the most demanding requirement of an effective speech—a specific purpose with a particular audience and occasion.

The group discussion receives emphasis as a part of speech instruction. Here, again, the small cadet sections permit numerous panel discussions by three to five cadets with a group leader and a small audience. In a course segment of five group discussion lessons, for example, each cadet acts as discussion leader once during the five lessons and participates in one panel discussion at each lesson.

Time does not permit any formal debate instruction for all cadets. The group discussion periods, of course, approach debate in that the same requirements of finding the issues—logical 'proof' and sound reasoning—are essential. During the closing periods of the spring term, however, while the remainder of the class is reviewing the work of the term a special course in debate is given to the upper half of the class. This debate course of about seven lessons presents briefly the principles of formal debate and permits each cadet to participate as a member of a debating team in preparing and delivering a debate upon a topic of current interest. The West Point Debate Council, which sponsors extensive cadet participation in intercollegiate debating as well as a program of intramural debating, is under the supervision of the Department of Social Sciences. The Department of English assists the Debate Council by bringing gifted cadet speakers to the attention of the Council and by critiquing delivery at cadet debate practice.

With the close of the cadet's first year his formal course in Speech-Making under the Department of English is suspended for a period. Third Class (second year) English is a course in world literature designed to widen the cadet's horizon and to increase his sense of cultural values. Of course, in this period of instruction as in all others the cadet is frequently required to give oral presentations in which the methods and the techniques of Speech-Making play an important part. Many departments make special assignments requiring speech technique. The Department of Social Sciences, for example, in its history courses frequently designates special topics for outside reading and study on which the cadet makes a fifteen-minute oral presentation in the classroom.

Toward the end of the cadet's third year at the Military Academy, just before he assumes the responsibilities of leadership of the Corps of Cadets as a First Classman (senior), the Department of English conducts a course in Military Instructor Training. This course of ten weeks covers those specific and practical applications of oral communication which a cadet must later employ as an officer-instructor. It is designed to develop the personal and professional qualities of the cadet as an efficient military instructor by a review of Speech-Making, by a study of the psychology and the technique of teaching, and by supervision of his work as he plans, presents, and critiques lessons on military topics. Here the cadet becomes an instructor; he selects lesson topics from approved lists; he prepares detailed lesson plans

and visual training aids; and finally he presents his lessons to a class group which acts as students for his presentation. Each such lesson is thoroughly critiqued by the class group and by the regular instructor. Concurrently with this series of lessons, group discussions on topics of current interest—military, political, and social—prepare the cadet to lead such discussions after he becomes an officer.

In summary the Military Academy firmly believes that effective oral communication, Speech-Making, is a vital part of the equipment of each officer in the Army and Air Force of a modern democracy. Its courses are designed to give detailed knowledge of the best modern methods and techniques together with frequent practice in speaking with a specific purpose to a particular audience. Major General Maxwell D. Taylor, Superintendent of the Military Academy, demonstrates his interest in the Speech-Making course by addressing each new class as it begins its study of the subject: 'We intend that each cadet, as he rises to speak to any audience, military or civilian, shall have a background of knowledge and experience that will permit him to feel *"Accustomed* as I am to public speaking. . . ."'

AN INTEGRATED SPEECH PROGRAM AT ANNAPOLIS

William S. Shields

THE standard beginning course in speech fights a lone battle in most colleges. Instructors in speech find that they are teaching a foreign language as far as other departments of the college are concerned. Slovenly speaking performances are condoned in history, economics, and even English classes. I believe there exists a dual responsibility for this regrettable state of affairs. On the one hand departments of speech have maintained an undue emphasis on formal address with insufficient attention to the importance of effective speech. The average individual has to sell his ideas to small groups whether in a congressional committee, on a board of trustees, in the office of a prospective buyer, in the front office asking for a raise, or in a history recitation. Oral communication is a universal need, an art that deserves cultivation at every opportunity. Departments of speech might well accent this value. On the other hand various academic departments have failed to recognize and to act upon their daily opportunities for developing the power of effective speaking among their students.

The United States Naval Academy has made considerable progress in establishing the speech program as an integral part of the curriculum. Inasmuch as the curriculum is a prescribed one for all midshipmen there is no divisive competition for students, and the speech program reaches the entire Brigade. The courses of the various departments are integrated horizontally as well as vertically within a given department. Thus, 'departmental barriers' are eliminated.

It has been found advantageous at the Naval Academy to combine in one department all the humanities and the social sciences excepting foreign languages and psychology. The Department of English, History, and Government provides instruction in composition, literature, speech, history, foreign policy, economics, and international relations. Although instruction in speech, based upon a standard college text in that field, is given, all courses of the department stress the continued cultivation of good speech habits. This procedure is not difficult among faculty members who regularly teach speech and history, speech and economics, or speech and foreign policy within a single academic department. The integration of the speech program is highlighted in the course in History of American Foreign Policy where every third meeting is devoted to talks based on foreign policy subjects.

The faculty of the Department of English, History, and Government assists the midshipmen interested in such extracurricular activities as debating, public speaking, forum discussion, and dramatics. The debating contests are organized on an interbattalion, as well as intercollegiate, basis. During the First Class (senior) year, a comprehensive after-dinner speaking program is held. Each midshipman is obliged to participate with a small group of his classmates on three occasions.

Active administrative leadership, rather than mere passive approval, is necessary to carry an awareness of the value of speech into all academic departments.

WILLIAM S. SHIELDS *is Assistant Secretary of the Academic Board at the United States Naval Academy.*

Each term at the Naval Academy the Superintendent arranges for a course in speech to be offered to officer and civilian faculty members. The demand for this course is very heavy, and since it is necessary to restrict enrollment care is taken to see that the membership includes a rather equal representation from each department. While a specialized academic department always has a certain power of self-perpetuation I believe that the integration of an art throughout a curriculum owes its life to continued surveillance and encouragement. Above all, there must be an honest conviction that it is worth while.

A COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM IN A TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Ralph G. Nichols and James I. Brown

IN the fall of 1946 the College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics in the University of Minnesota replaced its customary freshman composition course with a communications program. The central objective of the new program became that of developing in our students the basic language facility demanded of a college-trained person in the modern world. More specifically the new instruction was concerned with the improvement of skills in listening and reading as well as in speaking and writing—all being regarded as basic to successful communication.

This reorganization of freshman English was based primarily upon two considerations: that the attempt to develop correct and adequate language usage through instruction emphasizing written composition alone has not achieved satisfactory results, and that poor understanding of content material is obviously a frequent cause of incorrect and inadequate language usage. Forty-five per cent of the time an adult spends in communication is devoted to listening, 30 per cent to speaking, 16 per cent to reading, and 9 per cent to writing according to one estimate—probably the most conservative of all estimates yet made of the matter, incidentally. Is it not possible that we too long have been overlooking, or at least regarding too lightly, three important and available channels of communication through which to work for increased language facility? Even when college instructors in traditional composition courses are able to command good English habits in the written work of their students, the value of this training is all too often nullified by bad oral English habits. Furthermore, the importance of the development of those skills upon which accurate and critical listening and reading ability depend, before a student attempts to write or speak upon a subject, should be apparent. It is probably enough to point to the frequent testimony of English teachers that many a poor sentence in a theme has been found upon investigation to have been caused by an inadequate grasp of the material the student was trying to express.

During the past year some eight hundred students have been handled in our communications program with a staff of eight full-time instructors, six half-time instructors, and one full-time clerk-stenographer. Because there are certain problems peculiar to a small-scale communications program in a technical college—problems of concern, perhaps, to English departments elsewhere—a report of some of our experiences may prove helpful.

I

No doubt the most distinguishing feature of the program is its flexibility—a flexibility which permits a maximum variety of student needs and abilities to be met with maximum use of staff and equipment. This flexibility is evidenced in the number and the type of courses available and in avoidance of any set sequence of courses formerly recom-

RALPH G. NICHOLS *is Associate Professor and Chief of Rhetoric, College of Agriculture, University of Minnesota.* JAMES I. BROWN *is Assistant Professor of Rhetoric at the same institution.*

mended for all students regardless of their individual needs or abilities. Any combination of the following six courses may be required: Rhetoric 1L (listening emphasis), Rhetoric 1R (reading emphasis), Rhetoric 1S (speaking emphasis), Rhetoric 1W (writing emphasis), Rhetoric 2 (exposition), and Rhetoric 3 (persuasion). The particular needs of the student determine which combination of these six units of training must be completed. Some entering students—approximately 5 per cent last year—who are definitely superior in all four skills are reported to the registrar as *proficent* and are exempted from training in communication.

The concept of proficiency is an integral part of the program. Students are led to think in terms of attaining such a description of their processes of communication. The instructors recognize, of course, that the proficiency described is in terms of the freshman population only and that a broader concept of the learner's abilities would suggest that such a word as *acceptability* might be more appropriately used. Each student is required to take only as much training in communication as is needed to bring him up to the required level of proficiency within his own class population. This may be from one to four or five quarters of class work although, if more than nine credits are earned, any additional credits are regarded as elective. This concept has proved to be a strong motivational device. Both student and instructor become eager for the early attainment of *proficiency*.

Students who are completely exempted from freshman training or who are exempted after only one or two quarters of work are immediately encouraged to enroll in non-freshman courses in literature, speech, or composition where they will find both challenge and opportunity for further individual development. The intention is not to excuse students from English courses, but rather to place them in courses which will compel a full use of their powers.

2

We believe that the central idea of any communications course is to integrate the four basic skills in order to insure the maximum development of all. Nevertheless, we see no merit in integrating a definite weakness with several strengths unless special attention is paid to removing the weakness through an open recognition of it and through direct training designed to eliminate it. The four single-emphasis sections at the Rhetoric 1 level are intended for students with a particular weakness in any one of the skill areas—a weakness so conspicuous that it would seem to merit special attention. For example, a student might be proficient in all communication skills except reading. He may have developed certain faulty reading habits which put him at a distinct disadvantage. In our program he would be placed in a reading-emphasis section where specific attention could be given to his problem. There would be written and oral assignments growing out of his reading—assignments which would serve to give direction to his reading and at the same time give him additional experience in the areas of the other skills. But the emphasis would be primarily upon his reading problem.

If, in addition, this same student is very low in listening efficiency he is placed in a listening-emphasis section the following quarter for special training. In listening, as in reading, there are written and oral assignments, but the stress is on improving the listening efficiency of the student. Classroom activities include units of instruction on note-taking, on compensations for speaker inadequacies, and on the physiological

and psychological factors which affect listening efficiency. Periodic progress tests and regular reports of results are an integral part of the course.

Similarly, the writing and speaking emphasis sections help students who have problems and weaknesses in those areas. The speaking sections contain those students showing poor social adjustment in a speaking situation as well as those needing special training in voice and articulation. The training in these sections is built around the theme of open-mindedness. Students are directed to material so inherently interesting that they tend to lose their self-consciousness in bringing before the class the ideas and information of deepest concern to them. This theme has proved particularly appropriate and effective for the speaking sections where there is much shyness or lack of social adjustment as a result of the failure of students to take an interest in other people. In becoming concerned about minority groups they begin to think in terms of others, and they tend to forget themselves and their own problems.

The writing-emphasis sections are closest of all to the traditional composition course. But, even here, an integration of the other three skills is sought. Vocabulary development is strongly emphasized, although this is true in all sections since it is perhaps the most important single element common to all of the communication skills. Periodically, a few of the most stimulating pieces of student-writing are brought together in a departmental publication called *Samplings*.

If a student has no particular weakness or if he has corrected his weakness by a quarter of work he may be assigned to one or both of the balanced units which provide a more evenly integrated experience in the four skills. One of these balanced units, Rhetoric 2, is built around exposition with the student listening to, reading, speaking, and writing expository material. Rhetoric 3 is an accelerated unit in which are placed only those students who are already quite close to proficiency but who need one quarter of further training. It emphasizes the techniques and material of discussion and persuasion. Emphasis is on the development of an ability to speak and write convincingly and clearly on controversial material. There is frequent participation in organized discussions and in other activities designed to supplement the text theory with actual experience. A special device to make the student aware of current issues is the listening card. Every week on a three by five card he reports a radio discussion program such as Town Meeting of the Air, the University of Chicago Round Table, or Meet the Press.

The four single-emphasis sections enable the student to concentrate on his particular weakness; Rhetoric 2 acquaints him with those library aids of importance in his chosen professional or vocational field and offers him opportunity for a balanced development in all four skill areas; Rhetoric 3 makes the student more conscious of the tools of democracy—debate and discussion—and of the larger world about him.

3

The problems incurred in sectioning our students could never have been solved had not our college by faculty action completely cleared the first period of the day for the communications program. This permits all sections to convene at the same hour. Because no other freshman courses of any kind are scheduled for this first period this action also provides extra periods for diagnostic examinations. Each quarter the entire six days of the first week are devoted to diagnosis. Monday is spent in orienting

the students to the program, in collecting necessary individual data, in making announcements, and in scheduling further activities necessary during the week. The next four days are spent in testing. Two examinations in listening, the Iowa Silent Reading examination, an impromptu theme, an impromptu speech, and a short voice recording are included. On Saturday the students are given their section assignments for the quarter together with an announcement of texts and of the first assignment so that they may continue the work of the quarter with a minimum of delay. After the first week each section convenes only three days a week. Half-time instructors each handle two of these three-credit sections; full-time instructors teach, on the average, six hours of advanced courses in composition, speech, or literature in addition to their two sections in the communications program.

The efficiency of our sectioning depends largely on the detailed master record card prepared on each student. On this card are entered all diagnostic ratings and test scores collected during the first week in addition to other information about the student such as high school rating, ACE score, English Cooperative Examination score, personality inventory rating, and college aptitude scores. These cards are given to the instructor as soon as sectioning has been accomplished. He then arranges for a short conference with each of his students. The cards enable him to give each student a rather detailed picture of his needs and his abilities as compared with those of others in his group. The instructor is thus in a position to give intelligent counseling and guidance. A reading instructor, for instance, may notice that the written work of a student is of poor quality and may suggest that he hand in an extra written report or so on his reading during the term. At the end of the quarter on the basis of class work and alternate forms of the tests used for diagnosis, the student is assigned to the section which will best serve his needs during the following quarter. That recommendation is entered on the master record card.

4

One of the problems most frequently met in communications programs is that of securing properly trained personnel, a staff with training both in speech and in composition. Our own staff lacked this dual preparation at the time our program was initiated. Not more than half the members who had earned a graduate major in one area carried a graduate minor in the other. At first, speaking and listening sections were assigned to instructors in speech; and reading and writing sections to instructors in English. An in-service training program for instructors was launched to encourage self-improvement. It is being carried on through weekly staff meetings in which we exchange knowledge and methods and in which we enlist the help of persons from outside our department whose special talents are related to some phase of our project. Gradually, along with greater understanding of procedures and materials in the various sections has come some rotation of teaching assignments. In selecting new instructors we have sought persons who have not narrowed their graduate studies exclusively to one field. We also prefer those whose experience has included teaching in communications programs elsewhere.

Fortunately, when all communications sections convene at the same hour it is possible to effect an exchange of instructors for a day or so as the occasion demands. If a certain lecture or unit can be better presented by an instructor with a background in speech and anoth-

er by an instructor who has had special training in reading an exchange may be rather easily made. Thus, the best possible use may be made of staff members with special interests, backgrounds, and training. This single-period feature makes it easily possible, furthermore, for several sections to be combined for examinations, special lectures, or demonstrations of wide interest. All our communications students were brought together on one occasion for a presentation of two educational films of general interest and on another occasion for a demonstration of the reading-laboratory procedure. This grouping also allows for maximum use of our rather limited visual and audio equipment.

Another element—one we believe to be essential to any communications program—is the reading laboratory, four half-hour sessions being held every week. Instructors may, during conferences, suggest to students who have disparities between their actual reading performances and their potential reading performances that they attend the laboratory sessions. But attendance is entirely optional. Any student, whether in communications or not, may make use of the reading laboratory although at present our laboratory accommodates only a limited number of students.

5

We are well aware of the fact that the most significant results of work in the communications program are probably intangibles not yet capable of measurement. Our emphasis on measurement —and measurement of skills in particular—is not to disregard these more important factors. It is, rather, to recognize the belief that there is a definite relationship existing between these tangible, measureable skills and the intangible goals beyond.

To illustrate: intelligent listening, which involves critical appraisal of the message of the speaker, is not easily measured. But intelligent listening depends upon clear understanding. If a speech is not properly understood certainly any judgment of it will be subject to bias. Understanding, in turn, depends on more measurable attributes such as breadth of vocabulary, ability to recognize conventional patterns of speech organization, and ability to distinguish between fact and argument. Therefore, we measure the more tangible skills upon which the distant, intangible goals depend.

Furthermore, a concrete measurement program has value as a motivational device. It gives the student a feeling of accomplishment that is reflected in his stronger interest and in his faster development. This is not to say that we would substitute objective ratings for teacher-made, subjective judgments; but rather it is to say that we would supplement those subjective judgments with some concrete evidence of progress in measurable areas.

Such, in brief, is our communications program. There is a down-to-earth emphasis on skills, acquirement of which is basic to the realization of larger and more distant educational goals. Our contribution in the developing of these communication skills is that of bringing the student into vital, close contact with the many educational forces about him —of furnishing him an opening through which science, literature, and the arts may find ready access and equally ready re-expression.

PHONETIC TRANSCRIPTIONS

The Presidential Candidates

Extracts from radio broadcasts by three of the presidential nominees. The speeches of President Truman and Governor Dewey were delivered at the dedication of the Idlewild Airport, 31 July 1948; that of Henry Wallace at Shibe Park, Philadelphia, 24 July 1948.

Truman: . . . | ðə 'besɪs əv ɑɚ 'næʃnəl 'ɛfɚt tə rɪ'stoɚ 'kɒnfɪdəns | æn 'kɜɪdʒ | mʌs bi ˌʌn'wɛɚvəɪŋ sə'poɚt əv ði ju'naɪtɨd 'neʃənz || wɪɚ 'praʊd ə ðə 'fæk | ðət wi 'pled ən 'æktɪv 'pɑɚt | ɪn 'faʊndɪŋ ði ju'naɪtɨd 'neʃənz || wi ɑɚ 'glæd ðət ði ju'naɪtɪd 'neʃənz | hæz 'tʃozən ˌnɪu 'jɒɚk | æz ɪts 'pɜmənənt 'hoʊm || 'naʊ | 'wi mʌs 'sɜtʃ 'kɒnstəntlɪ | fɔɚ 'we'z tə 'streŋθən ði ju'naɪtɪd 'neʃənz | æn 'bɪlᵈ ɪt ɪntu ə 'wɜlᵈ ˌɔɚgənə'zeʃən | hwɪtʃ kæn men'te'n 'pɜmənənt 'pis | wɪð 'lɪbəti | ʌndɚ ə 'sɪstəm əv 'wɜl 'dʒʌstɪs || a əm kən'vɪnst | ðæt ði 'ju'naɪtɨd 'neʃənz 'kæn bɪ'kʌm | æn 'wɪl bɪ'kʌm | ðɪ 'ɪnstrʊmənᵗ fɔɚ ðə 'pisfʊl 'sɛtˌmənᵗ | əv 'ɔl ɪnᵗɚ'næʃnəl dɪs'pjuts || 'ðɪs 'ɛɚpoɚt | kæn 'eᵗdɔɔ̈də'reklɪ | ɪn ðə 'wɜk əv ðɪ ju'naɪtɪd 'neʃənz || ɪt wɪl bi ðə "frʌnt "doɚ əv ðɪ jʊ'naɪtɪd 'neʃənz || 'mɛ:n ən 'wɪmən frəm ðə 'fɑɚ 'kɒənəz əv ðɪ 'ɜθ | wɪlɔ̈'læn 'hɪɚ ɪn ðɛɚ 'sɜtʃ fɚ 'pisfəl sə'luʃənz | tu ðɛɚ 'kʌntrɪz 'dɪfəˌkʌltɪz || ˌrɛpɾɪ'zɛntətɪvz | əv ðɪ ju'naɪtɪd 'neʃənz | wɪl tek 'ɔf frəm 'hɪɚ | fɔɚ 'trʌbˌd 'ɛriəz tə mɛk 'pisfʊl | 'ɒn ðə 'spɑt | 'sɛtˌməntᵃ || . . .

Dewey: . . . | tə'deᵎ | 'ðɪs 'ɛəˌpoɚt 'stænz 'opən | tə ðə 'ɛɚ 'kʌməs əv "ə:l ðə 'pis ˌlʌviŋ 'pipˌlz əv ðə 'wɜl || me 'ðɛɚ 'sɪtəzənz ənd 'ɑʊɚz | 'juz ɪt̬ ɪn ɪn'krisɪŋ 'vʌljʊm || ɛks'tʃendʒɪŋ "ðɛɚ 'gʊdz | fɔɚ 'ɑɚz | æn ɛks'tʃendʒɪŋ "ðɛɚ aɪ'diəz ænd 'aᵁɚz || 'noᵁ 'aɪən 'kɜtn̩ 'stænz 'hɪɚ æz ə 'bɛrɪɚt̬ə 'pipˌ | ɔɚ t̬ʊ 'gʊdz ɔɚ aɪ'diəs || 'hɪɚ ɪn'stɛd | ðɚz ə 'waɪd 'opən 'wɛlkʌm | fɔɚ 'ɔl 'mɛn æn 'wɪmɪn əv 'gʊd 'wɪl t̬ə 'kʌm ən 'go 'frilɪ | tʊ 'waɪp 'aʊt ʌn'faʊndɪd sə'spɪʃɪns | æn t̬ə 'nɜtʃɚ ən dɪ'vɛləp ðə 'groᵁθ əv 'gʊd 'wɪl | æn 'gretɚ ɪnᵗɚ'næʃənəl ko'ɑpə'reʃən || 'ðɪs 'ɛˌpoɚt ɪz nɑt 'onlɪ ən ɪnvɪ'teʃən tu 'gʊd 'wɪl | ɪt 'æktʃuəlɪ ɪz ə kəm"pʌlʃən ə'pɑn "ɔl əv əs | tə si 'moɚ əv ðɪ 'ʌðɚ 'sɪtəzənz əv ðə 'wɜlᵈ || 'aɪ 'hop ɪt wɪl 'lid "ðɛm | 'ænd "ʌs | tə "lɜn t̬ə 'no itʃ 'ʌðɚ 'bɛtɚ æz ðɪ 'ɔɚdɪnɛrɪ | 'disənt | "pis 'lʌviŋ 'pipˌlz wi 'ɑɚ || 'ɔl əv ʌs ɪn 'ðɪs 'ʃrɪŋkɪŋ 'wɜl | "mʌs 'lɜn | æn ðə 'sunɚ ðə 'bɛtɚ | tu 'ʌnᵈɚ'stænd | ɑɚ 'supə'fɪʃəl 'dɪfrənsɪz | æn t̬ə 'noᵁ ɑɚ 'fʌndəˌmɛntˌ 'sɪməˌlærɪtiz | æz 'jumən 'biŋz || . . .

Wallace: . . . | ɪnɔ̈"ə:ɬɔ̈"ɜnɪstnɪs | 'aɪ ə'ʃʊɚ 'ju | ðæt̬ɔ̈ɪf 'aɪ wɚ 'prɛzədənt | ðɛɚ 'wʊd 'bi 'no 'kraɪsɪs ɪn ˌbɜ'lɪn tʊ'deɪ || 'aɪ ə'ʃʊɚ 'ju | ðæt wɪθ'aʊt 'sækrɪˌfaɪsɪŋ e 'sɪŋgˌ ə'mɛrɪkən 'prɪnsəpˌ | ɔɚ "pʌblɪk 'ɪntrəst | wi wʊd hæv 'faʊndɔ̈ə'grimənt | 'lɔ:ŋ bə'foɚ 'nɑʊ wɪð ðə 'soʊvɪɛt 'gʌvɚmənt 'ænd wɪθ 'ɑʊɚ 'ʌðɚ 'wɔɚ'taɪm ə'laɪz || 'ɪt 'ɪz 'nɑtʰ baɪ 'æksɪdənt | ðæt̬

'dʒɝməni hæz bɪ'kʌm 'wʌns ə'gɛn ðə 'hʊɚt əv ə 'kraɪsɪs || 'dʒɝməni 'wɪl 'bi ðə 'koɚ 'ʌv "ɛvri 'wɛl 'kraɪsɪs | ən'tɪl wi əv 'kʌm tu ənɔ̃ə'grimənt wɪθɔ̃θə 'soʊvɪɛt 'junjən || . . . | dʊ jʊ rɪ'membɚ hwɛnɔ̃'onlɪ 'tu 'mʌns ə'goᵁ | ɑɚ æm'bæsədɚ tə 'mʊsko | 'sɛntɔ̃ə 'notʰ | tə 'mʊlə,tɔf || ɪt wəzɔ̃ə 'notʰ | hwɪtʃ 'simd tʊ 'bi ənɔ̃ɪnvə'teʃn̩ | tʊ 'sɪt̬ɔ̃ə'raʊndɔ̃e 'tebl̩ əv 'rizn̩ | æn 'ɪnvə'teʃn̩ tə "tɔkɔ̃'ovɚ ðə 'prɑbləmz | hwɪtʃ 'hæv krɪ'etɪd ðɪs kən'tɪnjud 'stet̬ɔ̃əv 'kraɪsɪs || dʊ jʊ rɪ'membɚ haʊ ðə 'rʌʃənz rɪ'spʌndɪd | wɪθ hwʌt "simd | laɪk 'ril 'igɚnɪs || . . .

Transcribed from a wire recording by
NORMA DEL DIEDRICH, *University of Illinois*

ILLINOIS SPEECH

Transcription of a free conversation. The speaker was born and raised in White County in southern Illinois; has lived in central Illinois since the age of eighteen.

| aɪ 'θɪŋk ðət ðæt pɚ'tɪkjələ 'ᵗsɛkʃn̩ | ɑɣ ðə 'steᴵt əv ɪlɪ'nɔɪ nʌt 'fɑɚ frəm ðə ɪndɪ'ænə 'læɪːn | ænd | 'wɛl | ɪn ʍaɪt 'kaʊntɪ | 'ʍaɪt 'kaʊntɪ æn 'hæməltn̩ 'kaʊntɪ æn ðoz 'pleᴵsɪs | wɚ 'ɔᴵ 'sɛt̬l̩ 'baɪ ə'prʌksᵊmətlɪ də 'seᴵm 'kæɪnd əv 'piːpəl || ðe wɚ prɪ'dʌmənᵊntlɪ 'skʌtʃˌaɪrɪʧˢ ɪn ʔæʊɚ 'neᴵbɚˌhʊd || 'ovɚ ɪn 'kɑɚmaɪ ðɛɚz ə 'lʌt əv 'dʒɝmən 'ɪnfluənts || bʌt || ɪn | ə'ræʊnd 'ɛnfild | ðə wɚ 'ɔᴵ 'skʌtʃaɪrɪʧˢ | ændʰ | ɔ'most tʊ ə 'mæ̃ən ðe həd 'kʌm frəm ðə 'seᴵm 'pleᴵsɪs || ðe 'ɔː həd ə'rɪdʒənᵊlɪ 'kʌm frəm ðə ˌkeɚrə'laɪnəz̩ æn həd kʌm θʳu 'tɛnəsi ən 'dʒɔᵊdʒə | æn 'ɔl hæd ə"raɪvd ðɛɚ || maɪ 'pip ɚ ɔᴵ 'skʌtʃˌaɪrɪʃ || ðe 'keᴵm frəm keɚrə'laɪnəs æn fʳʌm 'tɛnəsi ən 'dʒɔᵊdʒə || maɪ 'fʌðɚs 'pipəl 'ɔl 'keᴵm 'ʌp | 'wɛl | 'noᵁ | nʌt "ɔl ʌv əm || 'sʌm ɑɣ ðəm 'keᴵm̩ | frəm 'dʒɔᵊdʒə || maɪ ˌgreᴵt'grænˌmʌðɚz ræ+ðɚ 'ɪntɚstɪŋ || 'keᴵm ˌʌp frəm 'dʒɔᵊdʒə ən 'kɛɚɪd hɚ 'lɪt̬l̩ 'sɪstɚ ʌn ə 'miuᵊl || ði 'pɛənts 'daɪd ɪn 'dʒɔᵊdʒə æn ðɛn ðe 'sɛnt 'wɝd fɑᵊ ðɛɚ 'grænˌpɛənts tʊ 'kʌm 'dæ̃ʊn tə 'dʒoᵊdʒ ən 'gɛt əm || ðe həd 'kʌm 'ʌp 'hɪɚ tʊ 'sʌdᵊn ɪlɪ'nɔɪ || ðe wɚ 'rʌtlɪdʒɪs | ˌbaɪ ðə 'weᴵ | maɪ 'græn | "greᴵt ˌgræn'mʌðɚ ən 'æn 'rʌtlɪtʃ wɚ 'kʌzn̩z | ˌfɝs 'kʌzn̩s || ænd | so ðɛn ʍɛn ðe 'wɛnt ˌdæ̃ʊn tʊ 'gɛt ðəm | ðɪs | maɪ ˌgreᴵt'grænˌmʌðɚ wəz ðɪ 'oᵁldɪs 'gɝˡ | æn ʃi roᵁd 'ɔl ðə 'weɪ frəm 'dʒɔᵊdʒə ən 'kɛɚɪd hɚ 'beᴵbɪ 'sɪstɚ || ɪn hɚ 'ɑɚmz || ɒn ə 'miuəl || aɪ ə 'koɚs nɛ́vɚ 'sə ˌhɚ || maɪ 'fʌðɚ rɪmembɚz hɚ onlɪ 'veᴵglɪ || bət ʃi mʌst əv 'bɛn ə | 'wɛl | 'raɪt 'smɑɚt əv ə 'dɪktetɚ || ʃi 'dɪdn̩ 'lɛt ə "sɪŋg| 'wʌn əv ɚ 'relətɪvz go tᵊ ðᵊ 'sɪv| 'wɑɚ || 'ʃi ˌsɛd 'ʃi wʌznt 'goᵁɪn tə ˌlet 'hɚ 'mɛn'foᵁks go dæ̃ʊn ən 'ʃut 'ʌp ðɛɚ 'kʌzn̩z || ən ðət ɪf 'eᴵbrəhæm 'lɪŋkən əd 'steᴵd ʍɛɚ hi bɪ'lɒŋ: ðɛɚ wʊdn̩ həv "ben ɛnɪ 'wɑɚ || ʃi sɛd ðət 'eᴵb 'lɪŋkən wəz 'dʒʌs 'poːᵊ 'ʍaɪt 'træʃ | 'ɛnɪweᴵ | kəz ʃi 'niu ɪm 'ɛvɚ sɪnᵗs hi wəz ə 'lɒŋ 'lɛgɪd 'bɒi || maɪ 'fʌðɚ rɪmembɚz 'hɚ || ðət ʃi 'θʌmpt ɪz 'hɛd wɪθ ə 'θɪmb| || aɪ 'hæv ɚ 'bɛːᵊd | ðət aɪ 'laɪk 'vɛɚɪ 'mʌtʃ ||

Transcribed from a wire recording by
HENRY L. MUELLER, *University of Illinois*

THE FORUM

THE 1948 WASHINGTON CONVENTION

The Annual Conventions of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, the American Educational Theatre Association, the American Speech and Hearing Association, and the Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation of the National University Extension Association will be held at:

The Statler Hotel
Washington, D. C.
December 28, 29, and 30, 1948.

On behalf of the officers and Executive Council of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA I wish to extend a cordial invitation to all members of the ASSOCIATION and other interested persons to attend the 33rd annual convention of the ASSOCIATION at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C., on December 28, 29, and 30. The convention of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA will be held in cooperation with the annual conventions of the American Educational Theatre Association, the American Speech and Hearing Association, and the Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation of the National University Extension Association. The convention program will be highlighted by three general sessions. The Honorable Everett M. Dirksen, Congressman from Illinois, Chairman of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives, will welcome the conventions to Washington at the first general session. His remarks will be followed by addresses by Rupert L. Cortright, Wayne University, President of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA; H. Darkes Albright, Cornell University, President of the American Educational Theatre Association; and Martin F. Palmer, Institute of Logopedics, President of the American Speech and Hearing Association.

The second general session will be devoted to a discussion of American foreign broadcasting, with representatives from the State Department discussing the methods and objectives of The Voice of America.

The third general session will deal with Speech and the Process of Conciliation under direction of Major Charles T. Estes, Special Assistant to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

Major General Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, is scheduled to address the joint luncheon of all Associations on The Impact of Military Training on Education.

The Catholic University of America will present a play, 'The Birds' by Aristophanes, at their campus playhouse.

The program of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA includes sectional programs on the following subjects, with the program sponsors:

Speech and the Elementary Schools—Carrie Rasmussen, Longfellow School, Madison, Wisconsin

Objectives and Methods in Educational Radio—Donley Feddersen, Northwestern University

Discussion—J. Jeffery Auer, Oberlin College

Linguistic Phonetics—Claude Wise, Louiana State University

Rhetoric—Wilbur Gilman, Queens College

Speech for Adults—Thomas A. Rousse. University of Texas

Reading Hour—William B. McCoard, University of California, Berkeley

Standards and Methods in Interpretation—E. Ray Skinner, Wayne University

Experimental Studies in General Speech—J. V. Garland, Albion College

Debate—A Craig Baird, State University of Iowa

Television: A Medium for Speech—Armand Hunter, Temple University

Public Address—Dallas Dickey, University of Florida

Teacher Training in Speech—Magdalene Kramer, Columbia University

Preaching and Homiletics—Batsell B. Baxter, David Lipscomb College

General Semantics—Irving J. Lee, Northwestern University

Speech in the Secondary Schools—Gladys Borchers, University of Wisconsin

Graduate Study in Speech—Andrew Weaver, University of Wisconsin

Reading Hour—Marion Robinson, Goucher College

The 1948 Campaign—Leland T. Chapin, Stanford University

Audiology: A Field for Speech (SAA and ASHA)—Raymond Carhart, Northwestern University

Recording Speech: Methods and Instruments—William J. Temple, Brooklyn College

Speech and the Liberal Arts—Mildred Berry, Rockford College

Voice and Diction—Jane Zimmerman, Columbia University

The Communications Course—Paul Bagwell, Michigan State College

School and College Broadcasting—Hale Aarnes, Stephens College

American Public Address—Bower Aly, University of Missouri

Speech Contests and Festivals—Mary Blackburn, Community High School, Granite City, Illinois

Rhetoric (Second Section)—Wilbur Gilman, Queens College

Cinema and Radio (AETA and SAA)—Kenneth Macgowan, University of California at Los Angeles

High School Forensics (NUEA and SAA)

Experimental Phonetics (ASHA and SAA)—Gordon Peterson, Bell Telephone Laboratories, New York.

The program of the AETA includes sectional meetings as follows:

Cinema and Radio (AETA and SAA)—Kenneth Macgowan, University of California at Los Angeles

Acting—Mary Morris, Carnegie Institute of Technology

The Broadway Theatre—Hubert C. Heffner, Stanford University

College and University Theatre—Monroe Lippman, Tulane University

High School Theatre—Roberta Seibert, Webster Groves High School, Webster Groves, Missouri

Directing—Valentine Windt, University of Michigan

Children's Theatre—Winifred Ward, Northwestern University

Dramatic Literature and Theatre History—Henry Schnitzler, University of California at Los Angeles

The American Theatre Scene—Robert Kase, University of Delaware

Technical Production—Walter H. Stainton, Cornell University

Playwriting and Dramatic Criticism—George Savage, University of Washington

The program of the ASHA includes meetings as follows:

Hearing—William Hardy, Johns Hopkins University

Voice and Articulation Disorders—James Curtis, State University of Iowa

State and Federal Speech and Hearing Programs—Merle Ansberry, Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C.

Experimental Phonetics (ASHA and SAA)—Gordon Peterson, Bell Telephone Laboratories, New York
Organic Speech Disorders—Claude Kantner, Ohio University
Stuttering—Spencer F. Brown, State University of Iowa
Audiology: A Field for Speech (SAA and ASHA)—Raymond Carhart, Northwestern University
Clinical Techniques—Lou Kennedy, Louisiana State University
Personality Problems and Speech Defects—Kenneth Wood, University of Oregon

The Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation program includes the following meetings:
High School Forensics (NUEA and SAA)
Federal World Government: A debate on the 1948-49 high school proposition (NUEA and SAA)

The Committee on Local Arrangements is making careful plans for the conventions of the cooperating Associations under the direction of Father Gilbert Hartke, Chairman of the Department of Speech, Catholic University, Washington, D. C. These plans include alumni luncheons arranged by interested universities, a reception for Association members, and other arrangements for your entertainment, convenience, and comfort while attending the convention.

JAMES H. MCBURNEY,
Northwestern University

AN AMERICAN REACTION TO BERNARD SHAW'S FORTY LETTER ALFABET

What Shaw says is, of course, obviously true, but I have grave doubts that it would be possible to go to a forty letter alphabet. It would make too much trouble for printers. Shaw, like all reformers, is too eager for quick results. It should be easily possible to substitute a new letter now and then, as the short *s* was substituted for the long *s*. But any effort to make a clean sweep would provoke so much resistance that it would end in chaos. Shaw greatly overestimates the disadvantage of the present English spelling. It really causes a great deal less difficulty than he seems to think. All other spelling reformers make the same mistake. They are very imprudent, and even foolish fellows.

H. L. MENCKEN,
Baltimore, Maryland

AN ADDITIONAL JUDGMENT

The adoption of Shaw's proposed forty letter alphabet is theoretically desirable. In theory it would save time for everybody who writes the English language, who reads it, types it, linotypes it, or learns to spell it. But I do not believe that this alphabet will ever be accepted in actual practice, and I base this belief on the outcome of such attempted reforms as those sponsored about forty years ago by the Simplified Spelling Board.

This particular campaign for reform got off to a wonderful start. Such men as Mark Twain, Henry Holt, Nicholas Murray Butler, and Williams James championed it, and Andrew Carnegie financed it. Furthermore, when the Board published its First List—a list recommending such conservative changes as the substitution of *catalog* for *catalogue*—large segments of the public responded enthusiastically. The simplifications were approved in whole or in part by the Modern Language Association, by the National Education Association, and by thousands of colleges and public school systems. They were approved by the editors of the Webster, Century, Standard, Oxford, and other dictionaries. They were used by nearly two hundred

newspapers and magazines, and were used by more than two thousand business firms in advertising and in correspondence. Even the President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, ordered that they be used in the publications of the Government Printing Office. Indeed, it is doubtful if any organized attempt to reform English spelling ever gained such widespread and hearty support as this one did.

And yet this attempt, like others, eventually failed. When the Board in its Second List and its Third List recommended that words like *foreign, lived,* and *head* be 'clipt' and 'trimd' down to *foren, livd,* and *hed,* public enthusiasm for the reform 'decreast' and finally 'ceast.' These later changes were too drastic for the public to stomach.

The experience of the Simplified Spelling Board suggests that spelling reforms which are conservative stand a much better chance of being accepted than those which are radical. The experience of the Board indicates, too, that even conservative changes in spelling are difficult to bring about. Nine out of ten of the 'long' forms, like *catalogue* for *catalog,* which the Board tried to drive out of the language still remain in acceptable usage today; and all the more drastic forms, like *foren* and *hed,* are not acceptable.

In the light of these facts Shaw's proposed alphabet seems to have little chance of being generally accepted. It is too radical, too drastic. It would change the spelling, not merely of three hundred words—the number included in the First List of the Board—but of thousands. It would require that all files, indexes, directories, etc., be re-alphabetized; that all writing machines, like typewriters and linotypes, be re-designed and their operators re-trained; that all adults learn the 'new' reading; and that all children learn both the 'new' reading and the 'old.' For such reasons as these I believe that public resistance to Shaw's alphabet will be much greater than anything ever encountered by the Simplified Spelling Board and will prevent the adoption of his alphabet.

FALK JOHNSON,
Northwestern University

A COMMENT ON WOODROW W. SAYRE'S ARTICLE

I noticed with pleasure Mr. Woodrow Sayre's article, Communication as a First Principle in Philosophy, in the April issue of your QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH. There are especially three points in the essay which, I believe, make it important. First, making communication and the community it presupposes basic to all experience stresses a fact that the psychological isolationists overlook. (Many literary philosophers, including the existentialists, are currently guilty of this oversight.) Second, this emphasis on communication becomes, under Mr. Sayre's pen, an occasion to show how unnecessary and senseless certain extreme beliefs are, in which terms are used absolutely, independently of contextual controls. The third point is not given explicitly but is nevertheless, for readers of your JOURNAL, the main thing. The essay's implication, for the art of significant speech, is that something more than the rules of *grammatical* syntax must be satisfied if all the potentialities of communication are to be realized. This something more is *logical* syntax, those deeper-lying rules governing the construction of bridges of understanding between person and person. It is mainly for this reason that I was so pleased to find an essay on the philosophy of communication in the pages of your JOURNAL.

VIRGIL C. ALDRICH,
Kenyon College

SOME COMMITTEE PROGRESS REPORTS

GRADUATE STUDY

The members of the Committee on Graduate Study are still in the process of defining the functions and purposes of this committee. For the present they are interested mainly in promoting discussion of graduate study at the national and regional conventions and in the official publications of the ASSOCIATION. The following have been mentioned as matters deserving consideration: the amount of emphasis to be placed on thesis study in graduate work, undergraduate training in preparation for graduate study, the distribution of speech and other courses in graduate programs, graduate training as preparation for the teaching of speech, the emphasis on the thesis study as an original contribution to a field of knowledge, and language requirements at the graduate level. The Committee has been assured by Dean McBurney that a program on graduate study is being planned for the next National Convention.

One of the present purposes of the Committee is to examine articles concerned with graduate study which appear in SPEECH MONOGRAPHS and THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH and, if there seem to be neglected problems and areas, to encourage and promote contributions which will make up the deficiencies. Very few articles dealing with graduate work in general have appeared in the publications of the ASSOCIATION during the past ten years. There have been a number of articles on public address as a field of research.

Articles which summarize the research which has been done in particular areas and indicate opportunities for further investigation are very helpful to graduate students and graduate advisers. The Committee has been promoting articles of this kind in radio research and audio-visual aids. Other areas will be dealt with from time to time.

H. P. CONSTANS,
University of Florida
A. T. WEAVER,
University of Wisconsin
HOWARD GILKINSON, *Chairman*
University of Minnesota

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE AND DISCUSSION

For some years most of the colleges and universities having active forensic programs have cooperated in the selection and use of single topics in the fields of intercollegiate debate and discussion. Each year the above named Committee has the responsibility of seeing that these subject areas are chosen and that appropriate wordings are determined and announced. Its work is carried on within the framework of a plan of procedure adopted by the cooperating organizations. Each of the following honor societies have two representatives: Delta Sigma Rho, Thorrel B. Fest and W. S. Howell; Tau Kappa Alpha, T. Earle Johnson and Claude Sifritt; Phi Rho Pi, C. Grant Burton and H. B. Mitchell; Pi Kappa Delta, Forrest H. Rose and W. C. Lang. THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA is directly represented by Lionel Crocker. Most of the work is carried on by mail.

After the Committee was organized in March suggestions for subject areas were solicited from over five hundred directors of forensics who submitted over two hundred different topics for consideration. The most popular subject areas in each activity, discussion and debate, were again submitted to the cooperating institutions for preferential vote. When these ballots were tabulated late in June the Committee invited a number of recognized authorities in the field to assist with the wordings. After nearly

two months work the members agreed on the following statements: In discussion the question will be, *How can civil liberties be guaranteed to all those living in the United States?* The debate proposition is, *Resolved: That the Federal Government should adopt a policy of equalizing educational opportunity in tax supported schools by means of annual grants.*

The Committee will hold two meetings at the time of the Washington Convention. One will be an executive session for the discussion of organization, procedure, and similar problems. The other will be open to all interested individuals and is announced as part of the Convention program for Wednesday, December 29.

THORREL B. FEST, *Chairman*
University of Colorado

PROBLEMS IN RADIO

Immediately following notification by President Cortright of their appointment the members of the new study committee on Problems in Radio began a series of meetings intended to survey and analyze the province of such a study. The findings of similar studies undertaken by comparable agencies of other organizations were reviewed for such light as the work of these groups might cast on the problems facing our own organization. In an attempt to learn something of the present status of radio instruction within the field of speech a study was undertaken of radio courses as they are listed in various college and university catalogues. The official bulletins of some 218 institutions among the 572 listed in the American Council on Education's publication, *American Universities and Colleges*, were carefully checked. It was found that of the 218 institutions analyzed some 115 list courses in radio. The Committee feels it will have some important and interesting considerations to raise as a result of the findings of this particular part of its study.

At the instigation of the Committee a study has been undertaken involving a survey of approximately six hundred representative radio stations distributed throughout the country. Appreciating the repeated criticisms directed at educational institutions regarding the type of training given those planning to enter radio as a vocation this study will attempt to discover as precisely as possible what training radio stations would like their prospective employees to have. The Committee is now engaged in the task of preparing a report of its activity for this year to present at the Washington Convention.

HARRY M. WILLIAMS, *Chairman*
Miami University

SPEECH SCIENCE

Your Committee believes that the following problems should be studied: 1. What is the present status of Speech Science in Colleges, Universities, and other private institutions? 2. How is Speech Science influencing the pedagogy of general and specialized courses in the field of speech? 3. What is the present status of Speech Science laboratories? 4. To what extent have authors of textbooks in the speech field invited attention to basic principles of Speech Science? To secure information concerning questions one and two a questionnaire was mailed to members of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA at all junior colleges, colleges, universities, theological and private institutions as listed in the geographical index of the Directory (pages 118-228).

The Committee decided to divide the membership of SAA into three geographical areas: eastern, central, western.

Using the above geographical divisions questionnaires were sent to 241 institutions in the eastern zone by John Black, 239 institutions in the central zone by M. D. Steer, and 122 institutions in the western zone by John G. Snidecor.

It was decided to make the first survey serve as a screening device to locate institutions active in the Speech Science field, institutions offering courses containing Speech Science principles, institutions maintaining Speech Science laboratory facilities, and institutions offering graduate study in Speech Science. For the purpose of this inquiry Speech Science is defined as that area within the speech field which is concerned with analysis and measurement of the physical, physiological, anatomical, and psychological variables involved in the production of speech.

It is hoped that an analysis of this survey will be available to serve as a report to the President with recommendations to be transmitted to the Executive Council of the ASSOCIATION by December 1, 1948.

JOHN BLACK,
Kenyon College
JOHN SNIDECOR,
Santa Barbara College
M. D. STEER, *Chairman*
Purdue University

SPEECH IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The Committee on Speech in the Elementary School is now sending out brief questionnaires to instructors in teacher-training institutions to ascertain the type and amount of speech training required of or suggested to prospective, elementary, classroom teachers.

In some universities the education students are required to take a course in public speaking or fundamentals of speech. This study is, of course, intended to improve their own speech but does not suggest to them aims for and methods of working with the speech of children. Speech instructors at the college level are more and more frequently suggesting that courses be provided for classroom teachers with just this end in mind: information on the normal development of speech, methods of increasing speech skills in the classroom, and ways of correcting minor articulatory defects.

Because many speech departments would like to know how extensive the growth of such teacher-courses has become, as well as the nature of the courses, the questionnaire requests the following information: speech courses required of prospective, classroom, elementary teachers; the title of such courses; speech courses usually elected; those provided for in-service teachers; examinations of the speech of teachers; and clinics where teachers can obtain advice on problems of pupils with speech defects.

The Committee is well aware of the fate of many questionnaires. It is hoped that this preliminary announcement will awaken interest and assure a greater percentage of answers than might otherwise be forthcoming. The speech field has long been strong at the higher levels but weak in its work with the speech development of children. It is the belief of the Committee that before urging more speech training for the elementary school teachers information must be obtained on the number and kind of speech courses offered at present.

C. AGNES RIGNEY,
State Teachers College, Geneseo, New York
MARGARET PARRET,
State Normal University, Normal, Illinois
ELISE HAHN, *Chairman*
University of California at Los Angeles

ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

The Williams-Romack Company of Columbia, Missouri, auditors to the ASSOCIATION, have completed their accounting of the records of the business office for the fiscal year 1947-8. In a twelve-page brochure of schedules, the auditors reported to the Finance Committee under date of September 23.

Operations for the year show an increase of income over disbursements of $3,768.58. The condensed statement which follows is taken from the brochure:

SCHEDULE 1

STATEMENT OF INCOME AND DISBURSEMENTS
July 1, 1947 to June 30, 1948

INCOME

Memberships:		
Regular	$13,496.87	
Sustaining	3,550.75	$17,047.62
Monographs		2,522.10
Directory		1,105.75
Old Journals and Monographs		733.58
Miscellaneous Bulletins		1,513.88
Placement Service		2,906.00
Advertising:		
Journal	$ 4,182.04	
Directory	1,155.00	5,337.04
Convention Receipts	730.33	
Special Convention Subsidy	1,000.00	
NEA Refund	198.50	
Interest on Bonds	30.00	
Miscellaneous Income	477.62	
Total Income		$33,602.42
Less Commissions		1,126.62
Net Total		$32,475.80

DISBURSEMENTS

Publications:		
Journal	$ 8,438.45	
Monographs	1,540.49	
Directory	1,266.66	
Special Printing	379.58	
Repurchases of Old Copies	175.55	$11,800.73
Mimeographing and miscellaneous printing:		
Stationery	$ 614.32	
New Solicitations	509.56	
Renewals	206.81	
Placement	415.66	
Convention	760.74	
Sustaining Members	18.70	$ 2,525.79
Postage and Distribution		1,461.46
Clerical		6,198.81
Officers and Committees		2,677.81
General Disbursements		4,042.62
Total Disbursements		$28,707.22
EXCESS INCOME OVER DISBURSEMENTS		$ 3,768.58

The auditor's analysis of the assets of the ASSOCIATION show an increase in net worth from $14,794.29, the position of the ASSOCIATION in 1947, to $18,263.22—an increase of $3,468.93. The principal items of increase are in the amount of cash in bank, accounts receivable, and government bonds. The complete analysis follows:

SCHEDULE 2

COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF ASSETS

ASSETS	June 30 1947	June 30 1948	Increase (Decrease)
Current Assets:			
Petty Cash	$ .70	$ 5.49	$ 4.79
Cash in Bank	4,017.72	4,580.76	563.04
Accounts Receivable	770.90	1,894.85	1,123.95
U. S. Government Bonds	2,106.50	3,106.50	1,000.00
Merchandise Inventory	4,937.25	4,943.34	6.09
Stamps	20.04	26.08	6.04
Total	$11,853.11	$14,557.02	$2,703.91
Fixed Assets:			
Office Equipment—Net	$ 1,765.60	$ 2,224.35	$ 458.75
Other Assets:			
Office Supplies	$ 527.46	$ 760.65	$ 233.19
Stationery	648.12	721.20	73.08
Total Assets	$14,794.29	$18,263.22	$3,468.93

The analysis of actual *cash* receipts and *cash* disbursements follows closely the ledger potential as presented in Schedule 1. A condensed statement of the cash position, taken from the report follows:

SCHEDULE 3

CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

Income: All Sources		$33,602.42
Less: Increase in Accounts Receivable	$1,123.95	
Accounts Receivable Charged Off	299.65	1,423.60
		$32,178.82
Disbursements: All Amounts Paid Out		$31,615.78
Excess of Cash Receipts over Disbursements		563.04
Cash Balance, July 1, 1947		4,017.72
Cash Balance, June 30, 1948		4,580.76

LOREN D. REID,
Executive Secretary

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

DOUGLAS EHNINGER, *Editor*

SPEECH CRITICISM. The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal. By Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948; pp. xvi+542. $5.00.

This is an important book deserving of much praise. The first *book* in the twentieth century written by rhetoricians and devoted entirely to the criticism of speechmaking, its materials embrace the history, theory, methods, and practice of rhetorical criticism. Accordingly, its scope and content are nearly all-inclusive: an introductory statement of the problems that confront the critic of oratory, and among them the definition and goal of criticism (Part 1, 24 pages); the survey of rhetorical theory from early Greek times to the present century—a survey presented on the correct assumption that standards of criticism derive from the theory as well as the practice of speechmaking (Part 2, 122 pages); the methods employed by the critics of speeches from Plato to the authors appearing in *The History and Criticism of American Public Address* (Part 3, 140 pages); the preliminary steps in the study of a speech: determining the *kind* of study to be undertaken—e.g., historical-theoretical, or evaluative—establishing the accuracy of speech texts, and reconstructing the social setting (Part 4, 42 pages); the standards to be used in judging speeches, including suggestions for evaluating the speaker's ideas, for appraising his technical skill, and for estimating his effectiveness (Part 5, 111 pages); and finally, the need for relating rhetoric closely to democratic theory and practice and to contemporary ethics (Part 6, 8 pages). Included also for each of the eighteen chapters in the volume are useful exercises and lists of supplementary readings.

We admire the learning, industry, and fortitude that the volume reveals. Our profession cannot be too grateful to Professors Thonssen and Baird for their pioneer book with its unswerving point of view that a speech is a speech and should be judged as such. Wichelns clearly formulated the position in 1925 in his essay, 'The Literary Criticism of Oratory,' and in the last twenty-five years others have of course restated, elaborated, extended, and modified it. There were, for example, the contributions of Hudson, Hunt, Howell, Bryant, Brigance, Aly, Reid—to mention but a few names that readily come to mind. *Speech Criticism* is aware of its debts; but despite the accumulating corpus of articles on criticism, Thonssen and Baird deserve acclaim for being the first among recent scholars to assemble, interpret, and shape a book-length study. Their originality therefore lies, first, in selecting and managing large and complex materials in the service of a position familiar to mature critics of speechmaking and, second, in organizing and presenting the whole so as to be helpful to the relatively immature.

The authors intend primarily that their book should be useful to classes in rhetorical criticism. Their intention, we believe, will be realized, for when

read carefully by the advanced undergraduate or graduate student and discussed in class under the leadership of a knowing teacher willing to take advantage of the exercises suggested and the supplementary readings, students will learn much that no other modern book can provide for them. They will know something of the nature of rhetorical criticism and much concerning standards and methods of criticism. The survey of rhetorical theory seems adequate for the purpose of the book, although one wonders whether, even in a short survey, medieval rhetoric and the Ramean-Talaean position on the provinces proper to logic and rhetoric can be entirely ignored. Blair is omitted from the digest of theory and is placed among the critics of oratory—doubtless a wise decision! The standards or categories for the appraisal of technical skill—derived from the survey and formally classified, amplified, and illustrated in Part 5—constitute a sound, general guide for practical criticism. Very good, it seems to me, are the materials dealing with the authenticity of the text of a speech and the reconstruction of the social setting—although we would wish for a more specific apparatus for studying the specific occasion. Highly commendable also are the many examples of criticism cited from both old and modern critics, for the examples illuminate the *method* of judgment being employed and at the same time illustrate the critics' modes of presentation. Interestingly enough, many of the examples drawn from the critics of antiquity and of the 'intermediate period' appear to be general judgments not illustrated by example and are cases of the impressionistic method at work—a method the authors may deprecate more than seems justified (p. 17).

The utility of the book extends beyond the class in criticism. The volume should prove useful, as the authors indicate, 'in courses dealing with rhetorical theory, advanced speech composition, and the history or philosophy of public address.' The scope of the book together with its many references, both in the notes to the text and in the exercises, makes the volume adaptable to many courses, and the well-trained teacher of rhetoric and public address should find it easy to make adaptations and assignments which will serve a variety of purposes. The book points in many directions for the curious student of speech-making. Furthermore, the volume should serve the mature student and established scholar as a ready means of reference to a large number of sources and titles. This significant and meritorious work will be widely used and much admired.

A work as significant as this will exert an influence beyond the classroom. It will stimulate earnest thought and speculation from those who wish to achieve in rhetorical criticism a literature as mature as in the other arts. The book will breed constructive endeavor, a tribute not often won by a pioneer work. Accordingly, I wish to carry on here and suggest certain problems central to rhetorical criticism which though unquestionably recognized in the book seem not to secure the focus and emphasis they should achieve.

First, what does criticism mean? Is its ultimate objective and main concern only or chiefly *evaluation and judgment,* as the authors assert (pp. v, 16)? If so, does it exclude *interpretation* whose aim is to *understand* a speech without intending—save incidentally perhaps—to express value-judgments? Without

being named, interpretation seems to be the object in two of four types of criticism, the analytic and the synthetic (pp. 17-18); yet the three stages of criticism (p. 9) seem scarcely to imply it. Would it not be clearer to the student if he were told that criticism involves two objects (separable, for the sake of analysis and study, though in practice, overlapping): interpretation and comprehension of a speech, and value-judgments of it? That each has its methods, procedures, and topics, that evaluative judgment normally follows interpretation, depends upon it, even uses the same method of comparison, though with a different purpose? Literary criticism has long been aware of such practical distinctions and a book thus organized would give promise of further illuminating the nature of rhetorical criticism, and of securing order and focus on methods and procedures. Furthermore, the character and essence of rhetorical criticism are perhaps not fully seen without drawing upon those who have written on the nature of criticism in other arts—e.g., upon writers concerned with methods and standards in literature, both practical and aesthetic, and in the pictorial, plastic, theatrical, and cinematic arts. *Speech Criticism* draws profitably upon a fair number of literary figures as critics of speeches, but few of them speak to the nature of criticism itself. Greater use of men like I. A. Richards, Kenneth Burke, T. S. Eliot, Cleanth Brooks, Max Eastman, Ronald Crane, John Crowe Ransom, David Daiches, and similar figures in allied communicative arts would lead to a well-rounded conception of criticism in general, and conception in turn would be adapted and applied to rhetorical criticism. Such materials and such a method would serve also to emphasize what rhetorical criticism is not and would provide admirable force for the authors' point of view.

Second, if interpretation is to be included in criticism, what is the *ultimate* object sought in understanding a speech? Is it not to discover and present the unique aspect of the speaker and his product, to set him off from other speakers, especially those contemporaneous with him? Valuable as it is to consider how well a speaker has coped with his rhetorical milieu and purpose, it is also revealing to explain how the quality of his adaptation differs from that of others with whom he may be properly compared. The authors are aware of this purpose, for they censure Plutarch's criticism of speakers for its failure to deal with the individuality of orators. They emphasize, moreover, that the method of comparison and contrast must operate in all critical judgments and many of their examples of critics at work use the method to shed light on their subjects. Yet in my opinion individuality as an end in criticism is not developed pointedly. For that matter, rarely do our modern critics of speech-making arrive at the final goal.

A third problem in criticism centers on standards of judgment—on *what* standards to apply and on *how* to employ them. *Speech Criticism* in general does well by the standards and categories proper to the appraisal of speeches. A speech is viewed as a genre distinct from other types of communication, with yardsticks peculiar to it. A reader, however, may speculate whether the problem is treated completely enough. What I miss is perhaps best indicated by these questions: 1. What are the timeless standards (the 'absolute' standards)

still appropriate for the judgment of speeches today? The book deals adequately with those standards. 2. What standards are regarded as being more appropriate to one historical period and social group than to another? And as a corollary, for what purposes is it justifiable to compare a speaker of one period with one of another period? 3. Are there standards (or categories) more applicable to the evaluation of one species or kind of speech than to another? 4. What makes one speech more *valuable* than another?

Although there are timeless standards, such as perspicuity, some appear to operate more prominently in one period than another. Today, for example, we seem not to expect nor to demand polish of style in a speaker, whereas the audience in the golden ages of Greek, Roman, and English oratory apparently did. It seems to me that rhetorical criticism should not only be ever aware of the relativity of standards, but should develop the point systematically for the young critic's benefit, perhaps indicating what standards and what tastes were held in highest regard in typical historical periods. The authors are certainly aware that standards may be relative, for they quote Peterson who makes the point (p. 166), assert that Cicero's estimates of orators would be better had he employed 'contemporary evaluation' (p. 168), remind us that Tacitus believed that standards are of the orator's age, and mention in many places the 'all-important necessity of a *standard of comparison*' (pp. 151-2). But as conscious as *Speech Criticism* is that canons may shift from time to time, the fact emerges almost incidentally. The standards which control critical comparisons are worthy of systematic handling.

The study of standards governing public address in a period sometimes reveals, furthermore, that the persistent canons have been turned to a purpose almost foreign to modern speaking. The full flowering of Roman, Greek, and eighteenth century English oratory saw audiences that to a considerable degree apparently regarded a speech as an artistic production. Speaking was a fine art, not solely a practical endeavor. For the days of Burke, Harding makes the point in 'The Listener on Eloquence' (*Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of A. M. Drummond,* 1944). Both the practice and criticism of rhetoric then have something in common with aesthetic theory and criticism, and the critic working in such a period errs if he overlooks the analogy and fails to deal with speeches as having some of the attributes of aesthetic objects. Recognition of this phenomenon would at least modify the point of view that *Speech Criticism* takes of the ornamental aspects of style and delivery, and the effect of technique on the hearer (pp. 456-7). It would also furnish some of the rationale for the controversy over Asianism and Atticism in style, a controversy that is perhaps given undue prominence in the section devoted to the critics of oratory.

The traditional division of speeches into deliberative, forensic, epedeictic, and sacred naturally gives rise to some canons peculiar to each kind of speech. Although *Speech Criticism* recognizes that fact, its great concern is with standards and methods applicable to all types of oratory, and in the treatment of them deliberative speaking fares well. Indeed, the slant of the volume seems to make rhetoric a branch of politics, a defensible and laudable inter-

pretation. Nevertheless, the critic of the eloquence of ages gone suffers some loss, for he does not have before him the special categories that arise when the appropriateness of idea, structure, and style is modified according to the kind of speech (the general occasion). Forensic, ceremonial, and pulpit oratory receive mention in the historical sections of *Speech Criticism*, briefly in connection with Aristotle, Cicero, and Rapin, and at greater length in connection with Blair, but the critical problems peculiar to them remain for the student to discover.

What are the standards of effectiveness in speechmaking? The authors discuss this question carefully and suggest six measures of effectiveness. They have done well—better than the difficulty, ambiguity, and confusion of the question would promise—and a critic is bound to consider effect as they interpret it in appraising a speech. Yet on this knotty question criticism must continue to focus. What of the standard, old as Aristotle, which suggests that a speaker, like the physician, should be judged as to whether he has done the best job capable of being done under the circumstances? Has he used all the available means of persuasion his heritage, education, training, and skill would lead a qualified critic to expect of a qualified speaker? The critic observes a particular speech and decides whether the speaker has lived up to standards of production applicable to that situation. Such judgment does not deal with whether the speaker gives promise of doing better in the future; hence the endeavor does not involve measuring the potentialities of the individual, his degree of improvement, or his speech as a performance, which, as the authors say, do not merit the critic's serious consideration (p. 454). Rather, as a criterion it complements judgments as to the kinds of response a speech elicits. The standard involves ethical considerations embracing more than the speaker's moral purpose; it takes in wisdom, intelligence, and skill. A speech is an instance of behavior and behavior seems still to be judged by the quality of action as well as the results of action. Furthermore, the character, quality, and life of communication in a democratic society depend upon such a standard. Moreover, the character and quality of production of a large number of speakers over a long period are closely correlated with the effect of communication. In short, we have both standards of production (a word not to be confused with performance) and standards of effectiveness. A critic uses both and recognizes their interdependence.

Perhaps the toughest problem that criticism in any art faces is this: What makes an experience, such as responding to a speech or to any artistic production, valuable? What determines whether one speech is more worthwhile than another? We refer here to what happens to a listener as he hears a speech, to his experience in the immediate communicative situation. The question, accordingly, is for the critic who is himself a listener and may be somewhat barren for the judgment of speeches which exist for the critic only on the printed page; for at issue is the hearer's feeling, recognition, and judgment, as a speech runs on and comes to its close, that he has been stretched, extended, turned, and stimulated intellectually or emotionally, that his time has been well spent, that the total experience registers as a gain for him. This quality

of experience is what Richards in his *Principles of Literary Criticism* and Kenneth Burke in *Permanence and Chance* are groping towards when they confront the question of value in a work of literature. And grope we must, for the essential character of the experience remains obscure, although it is manifestly different from responses labelled attending, perceiving, being interested, empathizing, compensating, and emotionalizing. Writers concerned with criticism in communicative arts other than rhetoric believe that what is valuable in the experience can be located and described, and that there are characteristics and requirements of the stimulus which prompt that kind of experience. What, then, is of value in listening to a speech? What are the standards of production by which the valuable is to be measured? If such questions are important to criticism, the critic of today's speechmaking must face them and make his contribution.

That *Speech Criticism* will direct further inquiry and serious study into the standards and methods of rhetorical criticism is one of its major contributions. Serious students of rhetoric and public address will long pay tribute to its authors.

KARL R. WALLACE,
University of Illinois

ENGLISH LITERARY CRITICISM: THE RENASCENCE. By J. W. H. Atkins. London: Methuen and Company, 1947; pp. xi+371. 16s.

To this new survey and reinterpretation of the history of English literary criticism in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries Professor Atkins brings the store of knowledge accumulated for his two earlier works: *Literary Criticism in Antiquity* (2 vols.; Cambridge, 1934), and *English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase* (Cambridge, 1943). He is, therefore, admirably fitted to evaluate with a keen discrimination the debt of English critics to earlier theorists for their doctrines, and the extent to which they modified ideas and principles inherited from the past, intelligently using what they borrowed to formulate standards directly applicable to the vernacular literature of their own times. Most of the materials which he re-examines in this book are familiar to students of literary history. Nearly all the English works are printed in one or the other of the two standard collections of critical essays of the period: G. Gregory Smith's *Elizabethan Critical Essays* or J. E. Spingarn's *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*. Among the foreign treatises contributing most significantly to the molding of English attitudes toward literary theory and practice, Professor Atkins singles out and for the first time adequately emphasizes the writings of the great Humanist educators, especially those of Erasmus, Vives, and the fifteenth-century Italian scholars such as Vittorino da Feltre, Guarino, Leonardo Bruni, and Politian. These writings, likewise, are for the most part available in translations and studies by Foster Watson and W. H. Woodward.

Indeed it is not by adding any significant new names to the roll of literary critics, but merely by reappraising, in their contexts, the statements of well-known Renaissance authors, that Professor Atkins supports his conclusion that 'despite the undoubted value and suggestiveness of much of the [sixteenth-century] Italian theorizing its effect was but vague and sporadic where English writers at this date were concerned.' Instead, he asserts—and this statement sums up the thesis of the entire book—that:

> . . . English Renascence criticism was not something which began in the 16th Century under contemporary Italian inspiration, but was rather a continuation of medieval efforts, coloured anew by classical influences derived from the 15th-Century Italian Humanists, and invigorated by a constant appeal to the laws of Nature or reason. (p. 346)

By rightly insisting that the animating principle of Renaissance thought was the grounding of all doctrines—theological, philosophical, legal, or literary—upon the authority of the law of God and the law of Nature or Reason, the writer sweeps away the fog generated by the

notion that abject submission to the authority of the ancients characterized the Humanists and their teaching. The authority of classical antiquity was generally recognized, but only in so far as its decrees could be reconciled with the superior authority of the law of Nature or Reason. This law was the ultimate guide, the sanction invoked not only when ancient example was being extolled by asserting that it was in accord with the law of Reason, but also when contemporary departures from the theory or practice of ancient writers were being justified. Thus the spirit of the age, with its exalted sense of the capacity of human reason to perceive truth 'by the light of the natural understanding,' gave the Renaissance critic freedom to use his own independent intelligence to formulate principles of literary art. Although he eagerly sought the guidance of classical precept and example, he felt always at liberty to follow the dictates of reason in evolving new literary theories applicable to the altered conditions of his time.

After establishing Reason, rather than the ancients, as the court of final appeal in literary judgments and demonstrating the importance of literary and rhetorical studies in the educational system devised by the Humanist scholars of the Renaissance, Professor Atkins proceeds in subsequent chapters to give a summary, interwoven with pertinent commentary, of the ideas about literary art set forth by various well-known English writers during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. His purpose is to show clearly how English critics, in general, adapted and augmented ancient, medieval, and contemporary theories, being characteristically independent and never 'wholly subservient to precepts found in books, to systems and rules' (p. 360).

Students of the Renaissance will readily assent to the soundness of the author's main thesis, and also to most of his judgments upon individual writers and works. Nevertheless, most readers will find his book disappointing because, in spite of its auspicious beginning and its many excellences, it fails in achieving the satisfying completeness it could so easily have attained. One cannot help wondering why, if certain writers were included, others of equal or greater importance were unaccountably omitted. Why, in a history of literary criticism, should Richard Mulcaster receive no mention? Why should Chapman's theories of translation be treated at some length, yet his theories of poetry be granted no more than a passing allusion? And why the complete neglect of John Hoskins' *Directions for Speech and Style*, ably edited in 1935 by the late Professor Hoyt H. Hudson?

Particularly regrettable is the fact that Professor Atkins seems wholly unacquainted with the contributions which American scholarship has made during the past twenty-five years to our knowledge of the various topics and authors he discusses in his survey. This deficiency many times prevents him from adding cogent arguments to support a point he is making and at other times leads him to make statements that require modification in the light of our present information. For example, a familiarity with the articles by M. W. Croll, R. F. Jones and others on the development of English prose style in this period would have enabled him greatly to improve his treatment of the same subject. Hoyt Hudson's translation and commentary on John Jewel's *Oratio contra rhetoricam* (QJS.14.374-92) would have called his attention to the qualities of playful ingenuity and burlesque in Jewel's academic exercise and put him on guard against accepting it as a serious manifesto of Jewel's critical theories. Atkins' laudatory comments upon the style and organization of Sidney's *Apologie for Poetrie* would have been more precise and illuminating had he taken cognizance of Kenneth Myrick's *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (1935). Moreover, he would have had to reduce still further the small credit for originality he gives to Francis Meres' treatise 'Of Poetry' in *Palladis Tamia* had he known of Don Cameron Allen's critical edition in the University of Illinois Studies (1933).

These are but a few examples illustrating the way in which the reader is continually made regretfully aware of how readily the defects of an otherwise excellent book could have been remedied had the author found it possible to examine and make use of the publications of the past three decades. Had Professor Atkins' book been issued in 1920 one could praise it without qualification. Today one must add the proviso that in numerous minor respects it needs to be brought up to date.

FRANCIS R. JOHNSON,
Stanford University

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE DICTIONARY. Edited by Clarence L. Barnhart. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948; pp. lx+1432. $6.00.

This major lexicographical undertaking

slightly bulkier than the *Webster Collegiate*, was originally published in 1947 by Random House; the Text Edition is being released by Harper. In the editing Mr. Barnhart has been assisted by a small but distinguished committee consisting of Leonard Bloomfield, C. C. Fries, W. C. Greet, Irving Lorge, and Kemp Malone, and by several hundred specialists who have contributed in varying degrees. The front matter contains short introductory articles by the editor, the committee, and others, sixty pages in all, one of which is devoted to pronunciation, two to etymologies, two to synonyms and antonyms, two to usage levels and dialect distribution, four to a handbook of punctuation and mechanics, and one to a table of the ACD and IPA symbols and corresponding English spellings. Following the main text is a list of American colleges and universities, and an index. Geographical and biographical listings are distributed alphabetically throughout the main text.

The critic's first impression is likely to be that the ACD has improved on earlier dictionaries. The type is clear, the definitions mainly good, the pronunciation symbols relatively simple, and the pronunciation itself more up to date than in any but the specialized Kenyon-Knott dictionary. Being up to date carries with it, of course, the danger of being soon out of date: Marshall is still Secretary of State, as listed, but Eisenhower is no longer Chief of Staff. The selection of biographical listings will not please everybody. Musicians may wonder why Ormandy and Rodzinski were omitted when Mitropoulos and Stokowski were included. Among artists, Dalí, John Sloan, and Jo Davidson have listings, but not Charles Burchfield, Gropper, or Zorach. Literary critics will find William Carlos Williams but, perhaps inevitably, not Tennessee Williams. James T. Farrell gets in, but not James M. Cain. In general, however, the biographical listings should serve undergraduate needs well. The geographical listings include many places made familiar by the last war; the same kind of spot maps that Mr. Barnhart first used in the Thorndike-Century dictionaries help to locate such places as Moravia, Lingayen Gulf, and the Gadsden Purchase.

The linguistic definitions have been considerably improved: *phoneme, allophone, morpheme, taxeme,* and *isogloss* are well defined and illustrated. The definition of *dialect*, on the other hand, carries some of the pejorative connotation that popular usage gives to the word, in contrast to the linguistic connotation of the word in Professor Fries' introductory article on 'Usage Levels and Dialect Distribution.' Definitions of Eastern and General American Speech, the only regional types listed, retain the old myth of the Hudson River as the boundary between them. Actually, no bundles of isoglosses run up and down the Hudson Valley, but plenty of them run east and west across it, and plenty of them run up and down the Connecticut Valley. The boundary, in short, is misplaced by almost a hundred miles, and the Hudson Valley isoglosses twisted ninety degrees off course, as far off as they could be. This confusion must surely be an oversight, though the mere recognition of the existence of the boundaries marks an advance over many of the ACD's predecessors.

Readers of this magazine, with a greater than average interest in pronunciation, will find little startling in the symbols, which are mainly the familiar diacritics, somewhat simplified, with the addition of [ə], which has become familiar to the users of the Thorndike-Century dictionaries. In his introductory article on pronunciation Professor Greet extends the use of [ə] to include not only an '*uh*-sound' but also an 'enfeebled *ih*, *eh*, or *oh*.' Thus the listings for such words as *authority, personify,* and *quality* show [ə] as the next-to-the-last vowel, and as the last vowel of *cousin*, without trying to determine whether the '*uh*-sound' or the '*ih*-sound' is more frequent. One wonders, therefore, why the more specific '*ih*' [ɪ] is indicated in the final syllables of such words as *carpet, foreign, forest,* and *laundress.* Since [ə] occurs at least as frequently as [ɪ] in these words, why not use the catch-all symbol [ə] throughout?

Recognition of the use of [ɪ] in such words as *ear, here,* and *cheer* is an improvement, and long overdue; other dictionaries have been pussyfooting around with [i] too long. Similarly, the recognition that [ɔ] is the predominant vowel of such words as *forest, orange, Lawrence, log,* and *gong* is an improvement anticipated only by Kenyon-Knott. It is too bad that the editors did not also recognize the existence of unstressed [i] in such words as *city* and *candy*, where their continued adherence to [ɪ] is surely old fashioned. Though most Americans outside of the South and the older age-group make a clear phonemic distinction between *candid* and *candied*, the ACD lists identical pronunciations. Similarly the equating of 'short *o*' with [ɒ] in the table of English spellings (p. xxxix)

is regrettable, not for any misleading of the student but for the encouragement it will give the lady elocutionists; outside of eastern New England and western Pennsylvania, 'short *o*' is normally [ɑ], and the ACD ought to record it thus. The same table also contains some minor infelicities. It is doubtful that *z* is the most frequent spelling of [z], in view of the great use of *s* in such words as *rose, needs,* and *Joe's. Discern* is a key word in the table for [z], but its listing in the main text shows both [z] and [s] pronunciations. *Courage* is a key word in the table for [ɜr, ɜ˙], but the main text also records the [ʌ] pronunciation. Curiously, the [ʌ] pronunciation is not recorded for *hurry, nourish,* and *worry,* though [ʌ] is as frequent here as in *courage;* and in large areas of the Atlantic states, predominant.

After, aunt, plant, rather, and other 'broad *a*' words follow the pattern set in the Thorndike-Century dictionaries, and are recorded with the ACD equivalents of [æ] and [ɑ]. This is better than the usual practice of having a single symbol intended to represent variation in pronunciation, but which is usually taken by the student to mean the prescription of the intermediate [a]. The distinction between [o] and [ɔ] before [r], as in *pork* [pork] and *fork* [fɔrk] is recorded, but without any notation that many Americans use [ɔ] for both categories. Similarly there is no indication that the vowel of *marry* may be either [æ] or [ɛ]; that of *Mary,* either [ɛ] or [e]. Like other dictionaries, the ACD uses symbols which are sometimes phonemic, sometimes indications of variable pronunciation extending over more than one phoneme, but without pointing out the difference in function.

Recognition of the [s˙z] variants in such words as *absorb* and *absurd* marks an advance, though *desolate* is recorded only with [s], and the related [gz] variant of *luxury* is missing. *Duty, tube, new, student,* and *thews* show [u] as well as the traditional [ju]. *Lewd, lute, rude, suit, suicide,* and *enthusiasm* knock the props out from under the radio announcers and lady elocutionists by failing to record the traditional [ju] at all. On the other hand, usage triumphs over etymology in the recording of both [u] and [ju] for *coupon. Question* is frankly [kwɛstʃən]; *diamond* may have two or three syllables, but *history, victory,* and *battery* still have three, at least until the next edition. In sum, the pronunciation system and the recorded pronunciations show a distinct modernization. The critic's principal regret is that a more systematic and thoroughgoing modernization must wait for a second edition, if any. No large project of this sort can be expected to produce a wholly satisfactory result at first. The ACD has made a good start. Let us hope for a continuing revision by a continuing staff.

C. K. THOMAS,
Cornell University

PUBLIC OPINION AND PROPAGANDA. By Leonard W. Doob. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1948; pp. vii+600. $5.00. Text edition, $3.75.

The title of this book suggests the sort of college courses for which it might serve as a textbook or principal reference work in such departments as speech, sociology, and psychology. It is currently being used in Kimball Young's graduate course in sociology and in this reviewer's course, 'Speech and Social Control,' at Northwestern University.

Professor Doob analyzes a large, chaotic, and fluctuating mass of material and organizes it into a comprehensible unit. He does so in terms of his psychology of behavior. He brings to bear, not only his long experience as a student and teacher of the subject, but also his wartime observations as Chief of the Bureau of Overseas Intelligence in the OWI.

In Chapter 1, 'The Importance of People,' he states that his book begins with man as an individual and goes on to examine many men simultaneously in the social situation called public opinion. His detailed analysis of propaganda, which he calls 'one of the important forces affecting men in social situations as well as public opinion,' has elements of uniqueness, as readers of his *Propaganda: Its Psychology and Technique* well know. Finally, he gives special attention to the modern media of mass communication 'because they affect and are affected by public opinion and because through them propaganda is expressed.'

In subsequent chapters he follows a similar psychological scheme in the treatment of typical behavior patterns. He writes of the concept of personality in terms of drives, habits, attitudes, and the like, qualifying the influence of these components on our responses to stimuli. His specific, precise definitions of attitude, propaganda, public opinion, and other slippery abstractions are based upon the raw materials of life.

Doob examines individually the elements of which public opinion is composed. His open system comprehends the emergence of public

opinion from varied social groups, its several modes of existence, its dependence upon our culture, and its peculiar reactions to environmental changes and the issues of the time. In this connection, the point of widest reader interest is his critical evaluation of present-day opinion polling. He stands in much less awe of the pollsters than most writers do.

In his discussion of the anatomy of propaganda, Doob does not confuse definition with ethical evaluation. He proceeds psychologically to relate the process to attitudes, social forces, and fields of human activity. In this book, as in his earlier one, he sets out a debatable classification of intentional, unintentional, revealed, and concealed propaganda. Following a section on propaganda content, there appears an account of the many devices used in making propaganda messages impelling.

Doob methodically recounts the means used by propagandists to intensify perception, suggestibility, and tendencies to act in a predetermined way. He writes of 'educational' campaigns, the retouching of facts, the undermining of unfavorable attitudes, the evoking of related attitudes, and the use of prestige, repetition, simplification, etc.

The propaganda media which he treats in three chapters near the end of the book are print, radio, and sight and sound. This last medium includes movies, plays, meetings, rumors, and parades. These mass media, since they reflect and assist in molding public opinion, are potent instruments of propaganda. The treatment of radio is the most satisfactory, but the point is made that the other two major media—press and movies—also tend toward a concentration of power.

The final chapter, 'The Value of Analysis,' argues the importance of analysis, explains the complexities of the process, and, most significantly, suggests a fourteen-point critical apparatus for the analysis of public opinion and propaganda. This is a helpful departure from the wholly inadequate lists of 'tricks of the trade,' such as the seven-point scheme of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis. Students of the subject need to be made aware of the complexities of the socio-psychological processes and of the consequent need for a more penetrating analysis within a wider context than that suggested by many writers.

Teachers of public speaking who use this book in graduate courses will find useful supplementary readings listed in the references at the end of the volume. A broader grasp of several controversial topics may be gained by consulting still other books and periodicals in the field. Some of these important controversial topics are: definition, origin, measurement, classification, and modifiability of attitude and public opinion; definition and analysis of propaganda; experimental evidence concerning the relative effectiveness of the several media of communication; the ethics of propaganda; and educational countermeasures. Of particular interest to teachers who consult the experimental studies is the tentative conclusion that the teaching of critical thinking is the best 'antidote' for propaganda.

GLEN E. MILLS,
Northwestern University

TONE LANGUAGES: A Technique for Determining the Number and Type of Pitch Contrasts in a Language, with studies in Tonemic Substitution and Fusion. By Kenneth L. Pike. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1948; pp. xii+187. Paper, $2.25. Cloth, $3.00.

The student of speech may complete graduate study with a linguistic horizon of comparative phonetics—often rudimentary—pertaining to the sound structures of the German, French, and English languages. He learns as incidental information that oral Hottentot and Chinese have besides vowels and consonants a characteristic that systematically differentiates words. These are two of the tone languages. Meaning is a matter of the relative pitch of the word in context. Identical combinations of sounds, differing only in vocal pitch, may have denotations as unrelated as *mountain* and *brush* or *mat* and *stone*.

Importantly, these are only two of the numerous tone languages among the world's people—extant or not. Anthropologist Paul Radin once remarked casually that the area of the United States prior to the English-Spanish invasion contained peoples among whom more than four hundred mutually unintelligible languages—not counting dialects—were spoken. Many were tone languages. Some persist in the Southwest.

Linguist Pike and his sister made field studies of two tone languages of Mexico—Mazateco and Mixteco. The structures of these are reported in Pike's monograph. The report is sufficiently complete for the student of speech to get a good notion of tone languages vs. English. Lest the reader wish to stretch the use of inflection in English to the point that he would label it *tonal*, Pike cautions:

> Pitch is also significant in English, but in English the semantic differential applies to

the phrase as a whole, constituting a shade of meaning rather than a dictionary or lexical meaning. For this reason English is not called a tone language even though it utilizes significant pitch, since a tone language must have pitch that is both significant and lexical.

We have become accustomed to the unit *phoneme*, basic in a description of English and similar languages. *Toneme* holds a comparable position in tone languages. Similar difficulties attend analyses based upon either of the two units. Critics contend that the phoneme does not stand still either long enough or consistently enough to be a reliable beginning of measurement. The toneme, likewise, behaves unstably. Pike contrasts the gliding-pitch and the register-contour systems and then finds considerable overlapping. Fortunately the languages he treats are register-contour systems and thus are amenable to the tonemic base. Even so—analogy, please—upon occasion one wonders whether the regular or irregular verbs predominate. For example, when the words for *mountain* and *today* appear together (Mixteco) as in 'I'm going to the mountain today' a change of relative pitch occurs without change of meaning. This and similar irregularities necessitate Pike's using many technical terms in order to dissect, catalogue, and explain a tone language that has grown and changed with centuries of use. The title of Table 5 illustrates the problem: 'Tonemes of Mixteco Enclitics in Relation to Tonomechanical Morpheme Classes Preceding Them.' (A footnote explains that one symbol 'indicates that it will perturb a perturbable morpheme following it.')

Pike fails to explain adequately how whispering occurs among the users of tone languages. He implies that people do whisper and suggests that intensity compensates for changes in pitch. The point needs amplification, for successful communication through whispering in a tone language almost denies the premise that tone is the feature of the language. (Footnotes indicate that the matter has been gone into more completely than the text reports.)

How does an investigator become accomplished in understanding tonemes? Answer: by listening to and repeating nonsense syllables at various pitches in one's mother tongue; i.e., ear and oral practice.

I am not including samples of tonemic notation. The reader is advised to seek what he wants from the apparently complete analysis in the monograph. From the critique that Pike develops and its application to two tone languages, he concludes:

> Analysis of tone languages is complicated principally by two features: (1) the relative, rather than absolute, nature of tonal contrasts, and (2) tonemes that change (a) nonphonemically when conditioned by segments, stress, quantity, intonation, or position in word or phrase, or (b) phonemically in morphology, or phonemically but mechanically in sandhi, or phonemically in syntactic constructions.
>
> Mixteco is interesting for its tonomechanical perturbations in sandhi, and Mazateco for its intricate layerings of tonemic fusion.

The value of this work for the teacher of speech is largely in the leads it offers for groping toward an understanding of oral language—phonemes, inflections, etc.—and its changes with time. Also the complete documentation cuts across speech, English, anthropology, psychology, and linguistics. References, however, are questionably selected. Articles of only historical interest to the phonetician take places with others of contemporary significance; and the inclusion of references to several studies, experimental in method, may mislead one to suppose that Pike and his sister were more objective than their ears permitted.

JOHN W. BLACK,
Kenyon College

TREASURY OF RELIGIOUS PLAYS. Edited by Thelma Sharman Brown. New York: Association Press, 1947; pp. 345. $3.00.

There is no field of dramatic activity in which there is more well-meant but misdirected expenditure of enthusiasm than in the production of plays for church organizations. The Introduction to this book states: 'Unfortunately what we often call "religious drama" frightens both the sincere writer and the skillful technician.' Too often the harried director of a play of this type finds the selection a formidable obstacle. In a pre-festival season he may be reduced to the doubtful expediency of making a catalogue description the basis for selection. Libraries usually carry meagre stocks of religious dramas, and only a relatively few progressive church bodies have established and maintained service bureaus to assist individual churches in their selection. As a form of tangible assistance in solving the play selection problem, Thelma Sharman Brown, Associate Secretary of The Mission Education Movement, has made a genuine contribution with this volume.

The book is designed for reading purposes only with specific directions as to the availability of production scripts and the leasing requirements of the various publishers. Twenty plays are included in the *Treasury*. An anthology of this sort must proffer plays which are designed to meet different situations, different seasons, and even a variety of messages. For that very reason any individual reader will find that according to his standards and experience some of these are excellently written while others are emotionally and melodramatically unpalatable. However, the general evaluation of the book must be that as a whole it fills a long-felt need, that it contains many examples of good dramaturgy, and that it meets well the avowed purpose for which it was published.

The plays are indexed according to type, season, theme, cast, subject, and time requirements. The cast requirements range from three to eighteen characters, and the running time averages about half an hour. More than half the plays require no royalty payment. In nature the plays range from the sheer poetic beauty of Stephen Vincent Benet's 'A Child Is Born' to the rather pedestrian attempt called 'White Christmas' by Dorothy Clarke Wilson—a specious item.

Among the most interesting plays included are 'It's Easter, Dr. Jordan,' which, in spite of its inevitable radio connotation, presents an *Allegro*-like theme and suggests a space stage technique which should add to the effectiveness of its production; 'The Symbol of The Cross,' with its simple meaningful prose; Iden Payne's less-known satirical drama called 'The Captain and the Kings,' which disregards chronology in the timelessness of its message; and 'Among Thieves' by Helen M. Clark, a parable of peace with a rather surprising emotional climax in spite of its otherwise static characteristics.

Although 'The Builders' by Frances Dyer Eckhardt is not a typical dramatic worship service, it is valuable to have this type included because it is not so widely known as the usual playlet form. Frederick Garrigus' radio adaptation of Dickens' *Christmas Carol* misses in contraction the vividness of Dickens' descriptions and scenes. Fezziwig's ball is reduced almost to a single side, and scenes and characters are introduced with such perfunctory orientation that a listener hearing the tale for the first time would be more than puzzled. This script in comparison with the more lucid annual network offerings would make its use questionable.

Other plays in the score included depict Biblical characters and events, some of them apochryphal and some of them canonical; still others dramatize missions, evangelism, race relationships, youth problems, honesty, freedom, and democracy.

This book should be of real service to anyone engaged in directing plays for church, church schools, and character building organizations, and to anyone to whom those so engaged come for help and advice.

WILLIAM C. CRAIG,
The College of Wooster

ENCORES ON MAIN STREET. By Talbot Pearson. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology Press, 1948; pp. 175. $3.00.

A distinct contribution to theatre know-how has been made by Mr. Pearson in this fine volume on successful, community theatre leadership. In its sixteen chapters he has housed with thoughtful care the experience and observations of a lifetime of theatrical experience. His straight-forward thinking on the director's place in the community theatre should be welcomed by neophyte and by professional alike.

Pearson defines the term 'community theatre' as covering 'all those play-producing groups which operate in the United States of America under a wide variety of names—little theatre, civic playhouse, community playhouse and a dozen more varieties and combinations.' There is no way of knowing just how many of these amateur organizations are in existence today, but each year their number is growing. This means that the opportunities for leadership are increasing and that leadership is more and more being placed in the hands of theatre directors. It is to these men and women that the book is addressed.

'A leader who possesses courage never lacks followers.' The director in the amateur theatre must have the courage of his convictions. At the same time, he must be willing to make concessions gracefully. He must take stock of himself continually, realizing as he does so that the eyes of the community are upon him.

Chapters 3 and 4 deal with theatre boards and the different procedures used in selecting the new theatre director. The author goes into great detail to show how director and board must come to a complete understanding before a contract is signed. A sample contract is included. The fifth chapter is concerned with planned theatre organization. Both the executive board and the backstage workers must know to whom and for what they are responsible.

'The important thing is that the director shall supervise production activities.'

Pearson also discusses the choice of the play. In some cases it is well to have a play selection committee. The director, however, should always have the power of veto. Only he can have the proper perspective of the individual play or of the season as a whole.

There is an excellent chapter on the selection of the cast. This has always been one of the difficult obstacles in the director's path. At one end of the scale is the more or less democratic public reading method and at the other the autocratic method of having the director call in the people he feels are best suited to the roles. The merits and demerits of the two methods are discussed in all their ramifications.

It would be possible to write at great length concerning the rest of the material outlined and illustrated in this book. Of particular interest is the discussion of the different types of temperament found in every theatre. Nor has Pearson forgotten the audience. Using it to help determine theatre policy is, he says, a sound practice. On the other hand, we must not lose sight of the fact that public opinion can be molded. Give them what they want but help train them to want the best things. This requires patience and 'a stubborn adherence to ideals.'

No director, whether young or old, can afford to be without this interesting and informative book. Also in this reviewer's opinion it might well form the basis of a course in the theatre departments of colleges and universities.

REID B. EREKSON,
The Fort Wayne Civic Theatre

EFFECTIVE TALKING IN CONFERENCE. By John Mantle Clapp. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948; pp. v+140. $2.50.

The word *discussion* is one of those which, as Alice discovered from Humpty Dumpty, means many different things. To the author of this volume, who addresses it to the 'busy man' concerned with handling 'the informal discussion of conferences and small meetings,' *discussion* appears to mean no more than *public speaking* to a small audience. It is not, therefore, a book about discussion as that term is commonly understood and must be considered on its merits as a guide to public speaking.

The author offers little to demonstrate his statement that 'conference talking has a special technique,' but he does provide a series of traditional procedures for improvement in speech-making. To combat 'The Arch-Enemy—Your Own Preoccupation,' defined as 'Beginner's Embarrassment, Carelessness, Misdirected Earnestness, and Overcarefulness,' he suggests three controls:

1. Make sure you have a message and determine just what it is.
2. Frame your message beforehand.
3. Watch your listeners and talk to them one by one.

The material on speech composition is summarized in a series of three chapters; any innovation in the book is obtained by putting it first. Chapters dealing with bodily action and voice follow, and the volume is concluded with material on the choice of words and the building of sentences.

As a highly condensed treatise on public speaking this volume may give some aid to the business executive and professional man for whom it was written, but in picking out its useful bits of advice he must also know how to evaluate such notions as 'If you can answer back in conversation you can learn to talk to a number of people together, and do it effectively,' or 'In talking to an audience there should always be a slight suggestion of reluctance—enough to make the listeners feel that you are addressing them not from a mere desire to do so but from a sense of duty.'

It is doubtless unfair to typify the style of the writing in a book with a single excerpt, yet the following sentences cry for quotation:

> Having clear grasp of a real message usually does away entirely with Beginner's Embarrassment. A telegraph boy can walk in anywhere without embarrassment; he knows that he is not going to be scrutinized personally; he is just carrying a message. Think of yourself as a messenger and you can stand up and address any audience, right now.

J. JEFFERY AUER,
Oberlin College

THOUGHT PICTURES IN READING AND WRITING. By Roland Barker. New York: Published for Metropolitan School Study Council by Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1948; pp. ix+114. $2.00.

The author of this little book—a member of the English Department at Montclair High School, Montclair, New Jersey—characterizes it as the result of some ten years of experimentation. Probably because of this experimentation, the author appears to know what he is about

and where he is going. His ideas have been checked by such scholars as Lennox Grey and Paul Mort; by a score of teachers in various places on the Eastern seaboard; and by the sponsoring body of this study, the English Committee on Unmet Needs of the Metropolitan School Study Council.

Barker's approach to language is functional and inductive both in theory and in pedagogy. Language, he says, should be studied in relation to its 'use' by those skilled in 'employing it' as a 'tool for effective expression.' The inductive element is clear, of course: principles are derived from illustrations of good usage and of 'effective expression.' Hence the concern in the book with 'working knowledge,' 'actual reading context,' and with exercises (many of them excellent). All this so that in the end pupils may become aware of the English language as something 'useful, stimulating, and dynamic.'

By now we have seen a long list of publications which have attempted to make English 'useful, stimulating, and dynamic.' The present book does it by dividing the meal into three courses, with the main one coming at the beginning. Part 1, 'Thought Relationships,' is much the longest section of the book. Its ninety-three pages include discussions of 'Basic Thought Patterns,' 'Statement Words,' 'Names and Substitutes for Names,' 'Modifiers and Their Substitutes,' 'Word Groups as Substitutes for Single Words,' and 'Punctuation Aids.' The material embraces what would be known in 'traditional' circles as parts of speech, types of sentences; clauses, phrases, and punctuation. Part 2, 'Analyzing Complete Thought Patterns,' consists almost entirely of some eight pages of exercises involving the analytical modes described in Part 1. Part 3 is a clever but sketchy treatment of 'Discovering Word Meaning'—how to get clues to the definition of a word through its function in a particular context.

All this adds up to a quite useful little book. The approach has a certain novelty and ought to help make for more vitalized class discussion. Moreover, the author seems to tread on fairly firm ground; one can almost see the many hours of trial and error which have gone into the formulation of this or that principle or illustration.

At the same time, the book is not without its own brand of naiveté. It is interested in 'function' far more than in 'terminology'; but it gets caught up by its own terminology. How meaningful are terms like *signposts* and *steering words* is still a moot question. Much more seriously, the author is seemingly unaware of publications which could have helped him considerably and which, in some cases, cover largely the same ground. This could have been a sounder and riper book, I feel sure, had it utilized the linguistic and grammatical materials of Russell Cosper or Porter Perrin; the inductive devices of Starbuck and Raymond; the rhetorical analyses of Foerster-Steadman, Haines, and Walter Blair.

This is all standard textbook bill-of-fare, of course. It is regrettable that Barker, like so many others in our field, has seen fit to do a piece of work without making an intelligent examination and *use* of what else has been done in the same area. As long as we persist in starting out afresh time and time again, we will succeed in having results which are unripe and—by a curious paradox—stale at the same time. There is a little of both in this publication.

LEO SHAPIRO.
New York University

THE LANGUAGE AND MENTAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN. By A. F. Watts. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1947; pp. v+354. $3.25.

After extensive testing of English children, Watts has here formulated what he considers to be the part played by language in mental development. He has outlined the various stages through which children pass in their efforts to talk and to write about the increasingly complex worlds in which they live.

Watts believes that his book will be of interest to parents and teachers; that an understanding of the various levels of development in speech, reading, and writing will indicate to the adult both the type of language and the type of experience best suited to a particular child. If the adult is familiar with patterns of growth, he will not talk a language different from that of the child; he will not provide adult types of experience; nor will he give a child ready-made meanings and expressions.

Language and thought, asserts Watts, are not two distinct processes. Most frequently, we think *as* we speak or write. Language serves to give organization and structure to thought. Certain of our familiar and frequently repeated ideas acquire a kind of internal sign so that they no longer need to be formulated. In creative thought, however, the individual needs words to perceive the thought. Thus, children in the classroom can present the familiar phrases of reproductive thought with fluency but, when they discuss a new experience, lan-

guage and creative thought are formulated together far less readily. The teacher and the parent should be aware of the nature of the experience in the child's world and should not require adult interpretations in language beyond the child's capacities.

Watts also stresses the fact that the child passes from his understanding of the concrete to that of the abstract by means of language. At first he names objects in firsthand experience, expressing their properties and discussing their relationships in time and space. Finally, as he matures, he generalizes on the meaning of the experience. It is, therefore, repeatedly advocated that the child be given firsthand experiences, that he be stimulated to formulate his thinking about these experiences in his own language, and then placed in more complex situations and again stimulated to discuss. In this way language and mental development proceed together. The presentation of secondhand experience, the supplying of words with dictionary meanings, the stock phrases and sentence forms make little contribution to actual language development.

Other chapters in the book are concerned with vocabulary growth, the development of structure in continuous speech, and progress in reading and writing. Watts' findings are supported by a variety of tests; these are included in the appendix.

This book is highly recommended to the conscientious classroom teacher because it contains a multitude of suggested procedures. Unfortunately, it is not probable that many mothers or primary teachers will give it the time needed for complete digestion. The material presented is so extensive that readers not interested in scientific research in language are likely to stop before completing it.

The study of the genetic development of language is much neglected in the United States. Such a book as this shows the extensiveness of the field. It can provide comprehensive data for students of language—particularly, advanced students in speech—who will before long, it is hoped, present these valuable suggestions through channels which will reach those most concerned, the parents and the primary teachers.

ELISE HAHN,
University of California at Los Angeles

PAPERS GIVEN AT A CONFERENCE ON COLLEGE COURSES IN COMMUNICATION. Edited by Clyde W. Dow. East Lansing: Michigan State College, 1947; pp. 79. $2.00.

Increasing attention has recently been directed to proposals which cut across traditional boundaries for teaching language competence. Although these proposals have taken various forms many of them have appeared under the headings of 'Communication Arts' or 'Communication Skills.' For the most part, they have stressed a functional approach to the teaching of the mechanics of writing and have encouraged the development of curricula which bring reading, writing, speaking, and listening into a unified course experience.

On February 28 and March 1, 1947, cooperating committees of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA and the National Council of Teachers of English sponsored a two-day meeting in Chicago devoted to studying college courses in Communication Arts. The 137 people in attendance at this meeting were drawn largely from Middle Western colleges and universities, with a sprinkling of representatives from publishing houses and from schools in the South and on the East and West coasts.

The ten papers presented during the two days—or digests of them—have been incorporated into a mimeographed publication, edited by Clyde W. Dow and titled *Papers Given at a Conference on College Courses in Communication*. In addition, there is included a partial summary of the results obtained from a questionnaire sent to those attending the sessions.

The volume contains contributions by recognized leaders in the field of communication arts. Its contents are grouped under four headings, paralleling the four topics considered at the meeting. The section, 'Content and General Method,' includes papers by Lennox Grey of Columbia University, J. Hooper Wise of the University of Florida, and Wilson B. Paul, then of the University of Denver; 'Selection and Training of Staff' has contributions by Porter G. Perrin, then of Colgate University, and Clyde W. Dow of Michigan State College; 'Testing and Evaluation' contains discussions by Wesley Wiksell, then of Stephens College, John C. Gerber of the State University of Iowa, and Franklin H. Knower of Ohio State University; and 'Administration of Courses' is considered by Wright Thomas of Grinnell College and Harold B. Allen of the University of Minnesota.

It seems to me particularly important that proponents of programs which aim to develop

effective communication of ideas by breaking with long-established college practices should not only be good men but good men speaking unusually well. In going over the papers contained in this book I had the feeling at times that some of the contributors might have made more compelling presentations had they been better exemplars of all that is meant by the phrase 'good communication.'

The materials presented are largely the outgrowth of experiences in teaching or administering programs in Communication Arts. Although some of the ideas have appeared previously in periodicals it is helpful to have embodied in a single volume opinions gleaned from such a wealth of experience. Individuals who are already associated with programs in Communication Arts or who question the effectiveness of traditional programs in the teaching of language competence will be particularly interested in this publication.

D. P. McKelvey,
Stanford University

SING WELL, SPEAK WELL. By J. Albert Fracht and Emmett Robinson. Brooklyn: Remsen Press, 1948; pp. vii+178. $3.75.

J. Albert Fracht, conductor of the Charleston Symphony Orchestra, and Emmett Robinson, director of the Footlight Players, Charleston's well-known community theatre group, have presented clearly and concisely, and in a delightfully readable style, the fundamentals involved in learning to sing well—with some unusually original physical exercises for achieving bodily coordination in the art of singing. Mr. Robinson has copiously illustrated the book with pen sketches remarkable not only for their faithfulness to the text but for the rich imagination and the sense of humor that they frequently display.

No dull, stuffy textbook this! The characteristic formidableness of the subject and of its presentation must go; though, of course, not at the price of throwing 'the baby out with the bath.' The clear, gay illustrations are one answer. The other is a text presented in simple dramatic form for a *dramatis personae* of three: Maestro, a warm-hearted but firm instructor in music and voice; Dulcy X, an aspiring young singer with her proper share of good looks; and Al Cappell, a young singer, serious, industrious, and well-advanced.

The drama is presented in thirteen acts or lessons. Lesson 1 brings the discouraged Dulcy to the Maestro's studio. The Maestro accepts her as a student and, finding her tied in knots vocally, physically, mentally, and emotionally, explains to her that the object in all his lessons will be 'the achievement of control and flexibility.' Lessons 2, 3, and 4 present exercises for breathing; for relaxation of the body, that 'tone' may be improved and produced correctly; for tongue, jaw, and lips, that articulation may be improved. Lesson 5 offers a simple, lucid explanation of the language of music. In Lessons 6, 7, and 8—with Mozart's 'Alleluja' as illustration—rhythm, the correct value of notes, as well as transition from one note to another, and phrasing are studied. With its clear presentation of the structural pattern of music, Lesson 8 is one of the most informative in the book. In Lesson 9 articulation is dealt with in some detail. Lessons 10, 11, and 12 take up somewhat removed, but vital, questions pertaining to public performance: stage fright and how to minimize it; the need to pay due attention to hall, acoustics, lighting, and dress—on the last there is a most enlightening essay for other ladies than Dulcy X; and entrance and exit. In Lesson 13 Maestro straightens out Al Capell who is having trouble as choir director.

In so far as good speech, like good singing, requires 'correct breathing, a well-balanced and relaxed body, correct tone production, [and] clear articulation' this book has value for the student of speech as well as for the student of singing. The emphasis upon diaphragmatic breathing, upon taking enough breath and emitting the desired amount of sound without straining—together with the original exercises therefor—should certainly be useful in improving the ease and tone of speech performance. Also helpful are the lessons for improved articulation, involving exercises for making tongue, jaw, and lips flexible, and some simple ones in phonetics with Gilbert and Sullivan as a practice sheet. The exercise to relieve a dry and rigid tongue is a little miracle.

In general, it is these physical exercises, in which the book abounds, that will be of value to the student of speech. However, it should be emphasized that this helpful little manual is slanted quite more directly toward the singer than toward the speaker.

A. G. D. Wiles,
The Citadel

THE PATTERN OF SPOKEN ENGLISH. By Barbara Storey. The Speech Fellowship Booklet No. 1. Oxford: University Press, 1948; pp. 28. $.50.

These three essays on 'Speech Tunes,' 'Emphasis,' and 'Sounds of Connected Speech' are

reprinted from the Speech Fellowship's bulletin. Starting with the statement 'One of the most fascinating things about speech is its expressiveness,' the essays attempt to make an elementary, simplified mechanical analysis of 'technique.' The argument is that because speech is such a natural thing we are not really aware of the more subtle factors of expression, and that there is considerable emotionally charged opposition to the gaining of more knowledge of techniques; e.g., 'What will become of naturalness if we have to bother our heads over this business of *how* to express ourselves?' Support is given by an analogy: The artist-speaker must learn his techniques just as a dancer must learn techniques of movement though walking, too, is natural to everyone.

A system of symbols is used to indicate stressed and unstressed syllables, and rising and falling inflections; it is the system found in *A Handbook of English Intonation* by Armstrong and Ward.

The analysis will be of interest to anyone unacquainted with the strengths and weaknesses of a mechanical approach. It undoubtedly has value for speech majors and for mature students who may need to get an elementary understanding of a mechanical approach to expression. Symbols are helpful for illustrative purposes, but the system breaks down whenever it attempts to become prescriptive. Too detailed analyses of what-happens-when remind one of the plight of the centipede who was asked which leg he moved first. Miss Storey says she does not pretend to do more than introduce the approach, but it seems that it is a difficult matter to introduce without getting out on some contradictory limbs.

It is surprising to find such statements as 'The range of pitch through which these speech tunes move is, normally, an octave. . . . The ear recognizes the "octave-tune" as the tune of normal conversation. . . . 'It is also surprising to learn that while the vocal attributes of expression may be analyzed and described, gesture and facial expression are to be 'unconscious—the outcome of feeling.'

WILLIAM B. MCCOARD,
University of California

TWENTIETH CENTURY SPEECH AND VOICE CORRECTION. Edited by Emil Froeschels. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948; pp. 321. $6.00.

If one reviews the literature of the field of speech correction he finds that the writing for each decade of the twentieth century has been clearly dated by its own special borrowings from the thoughts of world-famous explorers of the mind and body whose discoveries were under active discussion during the ten years in question. Such explorers were Watson, Freud, Orton, Köhler, Pavlov, and others. Among the writers in the field of speech correction there have been some who borrowed from these discoverers with extreme caution. They usually retained what they borrowed. Others have borrowed generously and have, like pack rats, discarded what they borrowed as soon as they chanced upon some new and, to them, more glittering ideas.

The book we have open before us, *Twentieth Century Speech and Voice Correction*, should be read in the light of what we have said above about borrowings.

The contributors to this volume are: Emil Froeschels, M.D., President, International Society for Speech and Voice Science; Elly Sittig, Speech and Voice Therapist, Federation for the Handicapped, New York; Jeanette O. Anderson, Ph.D., Director, Speech Clinic, Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois; Helen Hulick Beebe, Speech Clinician, Easton Hospital, Pennsylvania; Martin F. Palmer, Sc.D., Director, Institute of Logopedics, Wichita, Kansas; Shulamith Kastein, Speech Correctionist, Speech Clinic, Brooklyn College; Helen Schick Lane, Ph.D., Principal, Central Institute for the Deaf; Augusta Jellinek, Ph.D., New York; Samuel D. Robbins, Professor of Psychology, Emerson College, Boston; S. Richard Silverman, Ph.D., Central Institute for the Deaf; Dorothy Doob, Ed.D., Instructor, Department of Speech and Dramatics, Hunter College, New York City; Eugene Schorr, M.D., D.D.S., New York; Annie Moolenaar-Bijl, Speech Clinic, Laryngological Department, University Hospital of Groningen, Holland; Mary Wood Whitehurst, formerly Supervisor of Auricular Training at Hoff General Hospital, Santa Barbara, California; William G. Peacher, M.D., Philadelphia; O. R. Bontrager, Director of the Reading Clinic, State Teachers College, California, Pennsylvania; Charles H. Voelker, M. D., Head, Department of Physics, Washington College, Chestertown, Maryland; Frederica Schmitz-Svevo, Voice and Speech Therapist of the Department of Oto-Phino-Laryngology, City Hospital, Welfare Island, New York City; Charles R. Strother, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Speech and Psychology, University of Iowa.

If one were to take certain of the articles by these contributors, omitting the rest, he would have a book that would not properly be styled *Twentieth Century* but *Fifth Decade of the Twentieth Century*. Several articles in this volume could, however, properly be styled

'Twentieth Century,' since they are not clearly dated as of the 40's. This lack of dating may commend them to some readers and condemn them to others.

In spite of the lack of uniformity of temporal perspective, the coverage of the field of speech correction has been fairly complete. The book contains:

Chapter

1. Anatomy and Physiology
2. Aphasia and Its Treatment
3. Paragrammatism in Children
4. Dysarthria
5. Alalia
6. Psychic Deafness in Children
7. The Education of the Deaf Child
8. Acoustic Education in Children
9. Acoustic Training for Adults
10. Dyslalia
11. Educational Therapy for the Hard of Hearing: Speech Reading
12. Rhinolalia
13. Cleft Palate
14. Prosthetic Therapy of Cleft Palate
15. Pathology and Therapy of Stuttering
16. Cluttering (Paraphrasia Praeceps)
17. Hearing Rehabilitation
18. Disorders of Articulation Due to Gunshot Wounds of the Head and Neck in World War II
19. Remedial Reading and General Semantics
20. Education of the Speaking Voice
21. Education and Re-Education of the Singing Voice
22. Voice Training After Laryngectomy

Twentieth Century Speech and Voice Correction is a splendid book of reference for the discriminating worker who has achieved stability and a perspective of the field of speech correction.

ROBERT WEST,
University of Wisconsin

PRONUNCIATION EXERCISES IN ENGLISH FOR THE FOREIGN-BORN. By M. Elizabeth Clarey and Robert J. Dixson. New York: Regents Publishing Company, 1947; pp. 119. $1.25.

In the teaching of English sounds to the foreign-born there is always a need for further material to supplement the classroom work as soon as the student is able to study away from his teacher. Just such a need is satisfied by *Pronunciation Exercises*, for this is not a textbook but an excellent drill manual embodying a vocabularly suitable to the foreign-adult level.

There are forty lessons in the book. Each is based on a particular English sound and is headed by a phonetic notation of the sound with key words. The body of the lesson is divided into five sections: Production, Comparison, Sentences, Intonation, and Review Paragraph. There are additional pages of review sentences and at the back of the book a number of well-chosen reading selections in poetry and prose. Each of these is prefaced with helpful information concerning the author and his work.

The production of sounds is explained in simple everyday language and in such a way as to reinforce classroom explanations and illustrations. The foreign student should find especially valuable the material on sounds often confused, the lists of contrasting words and phrases, and the sentence and paragraph drills. In practicing these as well as the rest of each lesson he is cautioned always to work with an experienced person who can detect his incorrect speech patterns, thus avoiding the practicing of mistakes.

English sounds are taken up in the conventional order, beginning with the bilabial consonants. This leaves the teacher free to assign the lessons in whatever order he sees fit.

Several omissions might well be repaired in order to make the manual more generally useful. In particular, since the foreign-born student must be made aware of varieties in stress and length in English speech, certain lessons might include the several basic notations for degrees of length instead of merely the full length marks used in four of the lessons.

There is, nevertheless, much helpful material for practice in this little drill book. If used under the supervision of a capable teacher it should prove most helpful to foreign-born students as well as to others who wish to improve their pronunciation of English.

ALMIRA M. GILES,
Brooklyn College

SPEECH CORRECTION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. By Mabel F. Gifford. Bulletin of the California State Department of Education. Vol. 17, No. 1. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1948; pp. vi+38.

'Specially trained teachers are needed to care for the speech-handicapped students, but it is the function of the classroom teacher to give continuous training for developing the best speech of which children are capable.' So writes the California Superintendent of Public Instruction in the foreword to this bulletin of which the affirmed purpose is 'to offer practical sug-

gestions to elementary school teachers for improving the speech skills of the children under their guidance.' There can be no quarrel with these statements. In writing this pamphlet Mrs. Gifford undertook an essential task. Much of the responsibility for children's speech development does rest with the elementary school teacher, and there is a need for practical helps for her to use in fostering such development.

This bulletin meets the acknowledged need in several instances and falls short of meeting it in others. In the Preface, for example, Mrs. Gifford divides speech difficulties into two groups, organic and functional. Yet Section 5 of the pamphlet is entitled 'Nervous Speech Disorders' and there is no clear-cut statement as to whether such disorders are organic or functional, although it is observed that 'Years of research have provided convincing evidence that most nervous speech disorders do not have a physical basis as speech is normal under certain conditions.' This, certainly, is likely to be confusing to a teacher who may question: To what does 'nervous' refer? Is 'nervous' a synonym for 'functional'? First, then, a helpful, simple classification of speech difficulties is offered at the outset of the discussion, but it is not adhered to throughout the bulletin.

Part 1, 'The Speech Mechanism and Articulation,' includes a brief explanation of how speech sounds are produced, voiced and voiceless sounds, corrective exercises for articulation, and a paragraph on improving ability to hear accurately. The anatomical description begins, 'The larynx or Adam's Apple is formed of nine cartilages so placed and constructed as to aid in vocal sound production. Strung across the cavity of the larynx are the vocal cords. . . .' Although the chapter heading includes the word 'articulation,' no part of the speech mechanism is designated as being used for articulation and speech sound production is presented in terms of changes in resonator shape. This combination of over-simplification of anatomical description and inadequate explanation of function is not clear enough for the average teacher to follow. Twelve elementary school teachers and school nurses enrolled in a summer session course in speech pathology reported that the discussion was confusing. They agreed that the exercises presented were helpful but that if measures are suggested to aid articulation, articulation ought to be defined and discussed. On the other hand, the suggestion that vision be used to augment hearing is a valid one and might well be developed further in view of the increasing emphasis on speech *and* hearing programs of training.

Parts 2 and 3, respectively, deal with 'Improving Production of Consonants' and 'Improving Production of Vowels.' The former includes specific exercises and should prove helpful to the classroom teacher although it would seem that a brief explanation of the phonetic system used—indeed an explanation of phonetics—would help the person who has not had training in the production and joining of speech sounds. Part 3, despite its title, deals with vocal anomalies and does so inadequately.

'The Foreign-Language Speaking Child,' Part 4, starts out well and could have been useful had the author seen fit to include a chart indicating the sounds omitted, added, and substituted by foreign speakers, particularly those of Mexican and Oriental background. The materials in this section are not well organized; and the concluding statement, 'The more opportunity a child has to hear good English and to repeat what he hears, the more easily and speedily will he be able to eliminate his foreign accent,' makes one question, 'Is that all?'

In many respects, the section on nervous speech disorders is the best part of the bulletin, despite the fact that the classification of speech difficulties is inconsistent and the likelihood that many speech pathologists and correctionists will question the use of the term 'stammering, also called stuttering and hesitation.' No differentiation is made between primary and secondary stuttering, and the theory of causation is certainly not an eclectic one. The discussion of environmental conditions affecting the 'stammerer' is helpful, and the description of the child's inability to speak fluently should aid the teacher in understanding the problems of stutterers. Suggested therapeutic means are sensible, although the teacher may not find that following them will insure that 'spasms disappear and speech flows smoothly.' It is questionable whether the suggested instructions from teacher to pupils (p. 26) would aid materially in relaxing elementary school children. Suggestions to the teacher are, however, useful. The bibliography is, undoubtedly, helpful; but it is not exhaustive, discriminatingly selective, or up to date.

This bulletin is written to satisfy a need; it is on the right track. However, in an effort to simplify, it over-simplifies; in an attempt to be brief, it overlooks the fact that those who have had no specialized training in a field need careful explanations.

JEANETTE O. ANDERSON,
Rockford College

THE VIRGINIA PLAN FOR AUDIO-VISUAL EDUCATION. Prepared by James W. Brown. Chicago: The Center for the Study of Audio-Visual Instructional Materials, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1947; pp. vi+31.

LOOK, LISTEN, AND LEARN. A Manual on the Use of Audio-Visual Materials in Informal Education. By L. Harry Strauss and J. R. Kidd. New York: Association Press, 1948; pp. x+234. $3.50.

AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS IN THE ARMED SERVICES. By John R. Miles and Charles R. Spain for the Commission on Implications of Armed Services Educational Programs. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1947; pp. xi+96. $1.25.

AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS TO INSTRUCTION. By William Exton, Jr., Captain, USNR, Inactive. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1947; pp. xiii+344. $4.00.

As the titles indicate, all four of these books deal with audio-visual aids in education. The topic is timely. The current (August 14) issue of the *Saturday Review of Literature* contains reviews of six books on educational films and inaugurates a new section 'devoted to 16 mm. non-theatrical films.' These and other indications suggest an expanding interest in audio-visual aids in education.

The four publications here reviewed serve differing needs and interests. In the order listed, they provide: a description of a state-wide administration of audio-visual aids, an elementary discussion of the use of such aids in informal education, a short and concise statement of the uses of audio-visual aids in the armed services, and lastly an extended account of the use of such aids in the armed forces.

The first publication here listed gives a report of the development of Virginia's audio-visual education program. In 1940 the state legislature set aside $60,000 to encourage the public schools of Virginia to make greater use of audio-visual aids. Investigation revealed a number of obstacles: films were hard to get, the teacher could not be sure when they would be available, rental fees were often high, the quality of much of the available material was poor, opportunities for teachers to learn how to use the aids were limited. Regional Audio-Visual Centers were established at five cooperating Virginia institutions of higher learning, and the State Department of Education encouraged larger cities and counties to set up their own libraries of educational moving pictures. Financial assistance was given by the state; and by 1945 eighteen counties and cities had established their own film libraries. The legislature then appropriated $1,112,530 ($2 per pupil) to provide audio-visual materials and equipment. The report indicates how this money was spent: selection of materials for purchase, distribution of funds among the various types of materials, how the purchases were made. The organization and administration of the Virginia program are described, and the purposes of the program are stated.

Look, Listen, and Learn provides a comprehensive and simple exposition on basic matters such as types of audio-visual aids, the selection and use of equipment, principles of utilization, and administration. This is followed by a discussion of the use of audio-visual aids in particular situations: in religious programs, in summer camp, in health, and physical education, in public affairs education, and in public relations. This book gives a reasonably complete coverage of the use of audio-visual aids in informal (noncurricular) education. It can be understood by persons who are not familiar with the technical aspects of the subject, and it contains many suggestions about specific materials which can be used in various programs and situations. The value of this book as a source of practical suggestions is greatly enchanced by a series of appendices which include a selected and annotated bibliography, a list of commercial companies and institutions from which audio-visual materials can be secured, and a list of sources for equipment and supplies.

Audio-Visual Aids in the Armed Services is a remarkably concise and comprehensive survey of the war-time applications of audio-visual aids to instruction in the armed services. The authors limit themselves to straight reporting except in the last chapter where 'implications for civilian education' are discussed. Fifteen pages are devoted to a review of the research done on the effectiveness of training aids. Apparently much research was planned, but only a few controlled experiments were carried to completion. Surveys of the opinions of trainees and instructors indicated 'general approval of extensive employment of training aids.' A brief mention is made of a study of the use of the Mirrophone as an instrument for improving voice intelligibility, and the conclusion is drawn that effective use of the instrument requires the supervision of a trained instructor.

In the Preface to *Audio-Visual Aids to In-*

struction Captain Exton states that 'The purpose of this book is to make readily available, as fully and in as widely useful a form as practicable, the benefits of the experience of the armed forces in the creation of audio-visual materials for instructional purposes.' The first section of the book tells about the establishment of a training aids development center and a training aids library, and provides a discussion of the planning and testing of training aids. The rest of the book is divided according to the type of training aid discussed: projected training aids (films and slides), graphics (two-dimensional representations not designed for projection), sound training aids, and three dimensional training aids. A majority of the twenty-three chapters of the book were contributed by members of the armed forces and by civilians who were connected with and had special knowledge of the particular parts of the aids program which they discuss. Here is a rich source of detailed information about the use of training aids in the armed forces during the war.

The report on the Virginia Plan will undoubtedly be of value to persons dealing with the problems of a state-wide administration of audio-visual aids in the public school system, and *Look, Listen, and Learn* is a good beginner's book for those interested in the use of such aids in informal education. The two books on the use of audio-visual aids in the military program have interest and value for historical reasons at least. How much of that which can be learned from a study of the armed services training program is applicable to civilian education is a matter for debate—or better, a matter for discovery through trial and evaluation. One is certainly impressed with the energy and ingenuity displayed by the armed forces in developing and using audio-visual aids in their training program. No commensurate amount of energy was devoted to the objective evaluation of the devices employed, and even if there had been the questions would still remain: 1. Does the particular device have application to civilian education? 2. Would it have similar or equal value there? Nevertheless, all will agree that the experience of the armed forces should be studied by civilian educators with a view to the improvement of the uses of audio-visual aids in civilian education. For this purpose *Audio-Visual Aids in the Armed Services* should be read, and *Audio-Visual Aids to Instruction* deserves intensive study.

HOWARD GILKINSON and WILLIAM S. HOWELL
University of Minnesota

RADIO'S BEST PLAYS. Edited by Joseph Liss. New York: Greenberg, Publisher, 1947; pp. xiv+383. $3.00.

THEATRE GUILD ON THE AIR. Edited by H. William Fitelson. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1947; pp. xiii+430. $4.00.

As the title suggests, Joseph Liss set out on a hazardous task in selecting radio's best plays. However, readers who do not agree with his selection will be unanimous in agreeing that Mr. Liss has selected twenty good radio scripts if not the twenty best.

Actually, the title is misleading. Liss has limited his book to three basic themes which comprise but a very small part of radio drama: the terror of war years, the fight against this fear, and 'plays about people' based on visions, prejudices, experiences, and frustrations of Americans. Liss agrees that this limitation excluded many excellent scripts, that others were hidden by the very mass of available contenders, and that still others may not have come to his attention at all. However, he justly supports his choice of each of those included in the volume by means of a preface to each script.

Some readers will be surprised at the number of scripts written in poetic style. The author attempts a defence for including so many. Radio, he says, is peculiarly adapted to the pen of the poet for two reasons: 1. depending alone on sound, 'verse is no obstacle because verse has no visual presence to compete with'; 2. 'the techniques of radio . . . has [sic] developed tools which could not have been more perfectly adapted to the poet's use had he devised them himself . . . chief of them is the Announcer.' Therefore, one-fourth of the scripts are in verse. The reader may feel that this explanation does not justify the selection, but he is likely to feel that the selections justify themselves, in spite of their poetic form.

Among the twenty-four writers whose works are included are found many of radio's finest authors, not the least of which is Joseph Liss himself. The list includes such writers as: Archibald MacLeish, Norman Corwin, Thomas Wolfe, John Mason Brown, Marc Blitzstein, Stephen Vincent Benét, Norman Rosten, and Erik Barnouw. Only one non-American is included—Fletcher Markle of Toronto.

Teachers and students of good scripts will want to include this volume in their libraries.

Theatre Guild on the Air will prove of especial interest to teachers and students of the radio drama for two reasons: 1. all the scripts included are radio adaptations of well known and easily obtainable stage plays or novels, mak-

ing comparison possible; 2. in each instance the author of the radio version explains the particular problems he encountered in adapting the story to radio.

Scripts were chosen by the editor as 'representative' of those presented over the air by the Theatre Guild during its first year. A Foreword by Theatre Guild directors Lawrence Langner and Theresa Helburn describes the problems confronting the Guild in turning to radio and some of its findings relative to the peculiarities of radio drama. A Preface by the editor reports in part that 'censorship . . . is self-imposed . . . [and is] . . . no serious difficulty if the broadcaster has courage and exercises discretion.'

Twelve scripts are included in the volume. They range from comedy to tragedy, from 'The Show Off' to 'Strange Interlude.' Although the adaptations are well written and worthy of study in their own right, by far the most interesting and instructive parts of the book are the twelve prefaces written by the men who adapted the stories to radio. Through them the student is made aware of such problems as: censorship, selection of narrator, portrayal of thought, explanation of preceding episodes in a continued story, amount of originality permitted in an adaptation, tranference of visual comedy to auditory suggestion, expansion from a single set to radio's many-set stage, making timely a dated play, making a fantasy acceptable, locating scenes and characters in relation to others, creating such moods as nostalgia, cutting and shortening to fit radio time, presenting 'off stage' action, and many others.

F. L. WHAN,
University of Wichita

FM FOR EDUCATION. By Franklin Dunham, assisted by Ronald R. Lowdermilk and Gertrude G. Broderick. (Revised). Washington, D. C.: Federal Security Agency. U. S. Office of Education. Misc. No. 7, 1948; pp. vi+30. $.20.

With the Federal Communications Commission's allocation of twenty channels for educational FM broadcasting, there is now room on the air for more than eight hundred educational FM stations. At the time of this bulletin's publication fifty-one construction permits had been authorized by the FCC. In addition, nineteen stations were already on the air and eight applications were pending.

Both the FCC and the U. S. Office of Education urge that colleges, universities, and public school systems give more serious thought to the utilization of FM radio: 1. as an instructional tool for teachers; 2. as a medium for special-interest groups allegedly not serviced now by commercial AM radio; 3. for the promotion of superior types of programs, such as classical music and forum discussions of public issues; 4. for the training of students in the techniques of radio; 5. for supplementing administrative operations of schools, especially in the case of large public school systems; and 6. for good public relations, advising parents of modern trends in education. It is implied that unless educational institutions take advantage of this opportunity the channels will be turned over to the commercial broadcasters.

The testimonies of several educational FM broadcasters are given to emphasize the value and extent of the activities of non-commercial stations now on the air. For those who contemplate entering the field the FCC regulations, minimum equipment requirements, and estimated installation costs are provided.

The information in this bulletin, although certainly of value, seems to be colored slightly by optimism. From the financial standpoint alone, not to mention a few debatable aspects of educational broadcasting, the educational FM station poses formidable problems. Most broadcasters, especially the *commercial* men who today struggle to get out of the red, know that even the minimum initial cost—conservatively estimated by Mr. Dunham to be around $10,000—is virtually prohibitive for many of the smaller institutions. And that does not consider the perpetual costs of maintenance, power, staff, and supplies. True, these are the days of prosperity for many schools, especially the colleges with heavy veteran enrollments. But the years of the depression are not so long past that one does not remember the specter of financial insolvency hovering over many schools, both public and private. Even assuming that most institutions can make the financial plunge now, can a non-commercial, tax-supported or privately endowed FM station be maintained through the lean years that may be just around the corner?

PHILLIP J. MOHR,
Ohio State University

BRIEFLY NOTED

CHILDREN WITH DELAYED OR DEFECTIVE SPEECH. By Sara M. Stinchfield and Edna Hill Young. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1947; pp. xvi+174. $2.50.

This is the third printing of the original edition published in 1938. There has been no

change in either content or format. The first part of the book presents a thorough study by Dr. Stinchfield of various groups of speech defective children and contains much factual information regarding speech problems and related phenomena. The second part of the book, written by Dr. Young, is the most extensive presentation of the moto-kinesthetic method of speech training available in the literature.

CLAREMONT COLLEGE READING CONFERENCE. Twelfth Yearbook 1947. Claremont, California: Claremont College Curriculum Laboratory, 1947; pp. 158.

A collection of twenty-seven papers on the general theme 'Types of Reading Materials for a Functional Program of Instruction.' Of particular interest to teachers of speech are contributions by Ethel Carter, Ina Powers Sample, and Alma Wedburg in the area of aural reading.

EFFECTIVE SPEECH. By Harry Bainbridge Gough, Lousene Rousseau, Mary E. Cramer, and J. Walter Reeves. (Revised edition). New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948; pp. xii+654. $2.20.

In their note to the new edition of this standard work the authors state: 'The basic text . . . has not been modified in any way, but the illustrative material has been brought up to date throughout the entire volume, as have the bibliographies. In replacing the excerpts from speeches an effort was made to use speeches on vital subjects of the present day.'

LET'S MAKE A PUPPET! By Helen Farnam and Blanche Wheeler. St. Paul: The Webb Publishing Company, 1947; pp. 31. $1.00.

Designed for children, this profusely illustrated booklet presents simple but practical directions for making and operating a sixteen-inch puppet.

PICTURE WORD BOOK. By Garnette Watters and S. A. Courtis. Racine, Wisconsin: Whitman Publishing Company, 1947; pp. 178. $1.50.

This book was formerly published under the title, *A Children's Dictionary*. It contains 2153 basic words and 2678 variants. Each of the basic words appears both in print and in script. Pictures illustrate about 1200 of the entries.

Suitable for use through the third grade.

PETER RAMUS AND THE CONFUSION OF LOGIC, RHETORIC, AND POETRY. By Norman E. Nelson. The University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, No. 2. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1947; pp. 22. $.50.

A searching re-evaluation of Ramus' logical system.

THE DILEMMA OF POSTWAR GERMANY. Compiled by Julia E. Johnsen. The Reference Shelf, Vol. 20, No. 3. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1948; pp. 304. $1.50.

IN THE PERIODICALS

GIRAUD CHESTER, *Editor*

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS
WINSTON L. BREMBECK
University of Wisconsin

RADIO AND TELEVISION
GIRAUD CHESTER
Cornell University

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION
HUGH Z. NORTON
University of Michigan

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS
HAROLD WEISS
Southern Methodist University

SPEECH SCIENCE
JOHN V. IRWIN
University of Minnesota

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH
GIFFORD S. BLYTON
University of Kentucky

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH
JACK MATTHEWS
University of Pittsburgh

During the absence of Giraud Chester the material for this issue has been collected and edited by John V. Irwin.

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

A GUIDE TO SUCCESSFUL CONFERENCE LEADERSHIP (1), *Personnel*, 24 (March, 1948).328-40.

In a series of two articles the editors of *Personnel* present a digest of the course in conference leadership as presented to the supervisors of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey at their Esso Training Center. This first article discusses preparation for leadership and conference procedure.

A GUIDE TO SUCCESSFUL CONFERENCE LEADERSHIP (2), *Personnel*, 25 (July, 1948).31-46.

This article provides training hints for the conference leader and presents comprehensive evaluation sheets for appraising the conference leader's performance.

ALDRICH, JULIAN C., Developing Critical Thinking, *Social Education*, 12 (March, 1948).115-8.

Of special interest to teachers of argumentation is this report on a program at New York University designed to teach critical thinking in the social studies.

BOYD, WILLIAM R., GEORGE M. TITUS, ADDISON PARKER, and EMORY H. ENGLISH, Eminent Iowan—Jonathan P. Dolliver, *Annals of Iowa*, 29 (July, 1948).335-65.

Jonathan Prentiss Dolliver, United States Representative 1889-1900 and United States Senator 1900-1910, is discussed in this *Eminent Iowan Series* both as an orator of rare ability and as a campaigner, with comments regarding his political alignment and its justification.

CAIRNES, LAURA J., To Group or Not to Group, *Baltimore Bulletin of Education*, 25 (April-June, 1948).263-8.

A high school principal provides students of group discussion with more information on and evaluation of the problem of students working in groups.

CHEIN, ISIDOR, Behavior Theory and the Behavior of Attitudes: Some Critical Comments, *Psychological Review*, 55 (May, 1948).175-88.

Students of persuasion theory will find in this article a provocative consideration of attitudes and a challenge of Professor Doob's definition of attitudes.

DALE, EDGAR, and JEANNE S. CHALL, A Formula for Predicting Readability, *Educational Research Bulletin*, 27 (January 21, 1948).11-28.

Along with the growing need for more scientific means of verbal communication there has been a growing fund of practical objective measurements of readability. After reviewing and evaluating the earlier formulae of Irving Lorge and Rudolf Flesch the writers project the most recent formula for predicting the readability of a composition.

EYSENCH, H. J., and S. CROWN, National Stereotypes: An Experimental and Methodological Study, *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, 2 (Spring, 1948).26-37.

Believing that experimental evidence concerning the rise of national stereotypes is needed in this day the authors sought to provide some by studying the rise of national stereotypes among urban, non-student, middle-class adults in London.

HALSTEAD, GORDON B., Forums for the People, *Film Forum Review* 3 (Spring, 1948).5-8.

The film forum as a discussion technique is evaluated by the director of International Film Forums after conducting a series of 75 such Forums in 14 cities and towns.

HERMAN, LOUIS J., Harold E. Stassen, *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 47 (July, 1948).285-97.

The author analyzes Stassen as a man, as a political leader, and as a campaigner.

HODSON, JEANETTE, Propaganda Techniques Employed in the Women's Army Corps, *Journalism Quarterly*, 25 (June, 1948).151-6.

Because the Women's Army Corps needed to rely on recruiting propaganda to fill the ranks of the W.A.C. new propaganda techniques were developed to get women to perform military service with men on a large scale. This condensation of an M.A. thesis by a member of the W.A.C. reports these new techniques.

HOLLMAN, ROBERT B., Napoleonic and Hitlerian Wartime Propaganda, *Social Education*, 12 (April, 1948).157-9.

'Whether or not Hitler consciously imitated Napoleon, there can be no doubt that he followed many of the Frenchman's policies.' The author supports this statement in a comparison of the propaganda techniques of these two conquerors.

KELLOR, FRANCES, Random Thoughts on Good Behavior in Arbitration, *The Arbitration Journal*, 3 (Spring, 1948).5-8.

Readers interested in the conduct of participants in group discussion will find in this article the suggestions of the first vice-president of the American Arbitration Association regarding the conduct of the parties in the discussions involved in cases of arbitration.

LUNDBERG, GEORGE A., Some Views on Semantics in International Relations, *American Prospective*, 2 (June, 1948).127-32.

The author takes a critical look at the word labels used by modern politicians in the field of international relations and raises the question 'whether there is any reason to expect progress in the adjustment of situations as long as they are dealt with in symbols and sentences meaning all things to all men and which, in any event, do not correspond to the events with which we must come to terms.'

PICKETT, HAROLD T., A Historic Sermon, *The Negro*, 6 (July-August, 1948).38-40.

The Reverend Henry Highland Garnet was the first colored man to speak publicly in our nation's capitol building. On February 12, 1865, this preacher and great debater from Oneida Institute delivered in the House of Representatives the sermon commemorating the prospect of the abolition of slavery by the Thirteenth Amendment. This article reports that historic sermon.

RANSOM, JOHN C., The Literary Criticism of Aristotle, *The Kenyon Review*, 10 (Summer, 1948).382-402.

Although both Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* contain his literary criticism the author waives the *Rhetoric* and spends his time on a very thoughtful discussion of Aristotle's literary criticism as given in the *Poetics*.

ROBBINS, IRVING, Point of View and Quality of Thought in Attitude Measurement, *Educational Research Bulletin*, 27 (April 14, 1948).97-101.

This article reports an experiment which was conducted at the University of Cincinnati and which provides the answers to two questions: 1. 'Does an individual tend to select more agreement responses for an opinion he is most partial to than for an opinion with which he is in disagreement?' 2. 'Is there any difference in the accuracy with which a person selects reasons for an opinion to which he is partial and for an opinion he does not hold?'

SANTAYANA, GEORGE, The Vortex of Dialectic, *The Atlantic*, 181 (May, 1948).51-8.

Still writing with vigor and sapience an eminent philosopher gives a *Dialogue* which provides insight into the nature of dialectic and the author's attitude toward it. 'The order of nature is disguised and reversed by dialectic.'

WELFORD, A. T., The Use of Archaic Language in Religious Expression: An Example of 'Canalized Response,' *The British Journal of Psychology*, 38, Part 4 (June, 1948).209-17.

The use of archaic language in religious speaking has intrigued students of public address. The experiment described in this article 'was designed to study the liking for the type of language found in the Authorized Version of the Bible when used for various classes of prose passage, some religious, some secular, and to compare preferences for this type as opposed to more modern language among groups of subjects having different degrees of church attachment.'

RADIO AND TELEVISION

ARMSTRONG OF RADIO, *Fortune*, 37 (February, 1948).89-91ff.

An account of Armstrong's discoveries—ranging from the regenerative circuit to FM—and of their acceptance by the radio industry provides an interesting series of episodes in the history of broadcasting.

BEVILLE, HUGH M., JR., The Challenge of the New Media: Television, FM, and Facsimile, *Journalism Quarterly*, 25 (March, 1948).3-11.

NBC's director of research discusses 'the need to achieve technical and artistic mastery' of the new vehicles of electronic mass communication, 'the development of economic support for these new media,' 'how these new media are to be controlled by the government,' and 'their potential impact on all existing media of communication.'

CONRAD, EDWIN, Economic Aspects of Radio Regulation, *Virginia Law Review*, 34 (April, 1948).283-304.

'Today the responsibility as to program service rests with the American broadcaster alone. Excessive commercialism is a moral problem which the broadcast industry must itself resolve. If it does not, Congress will be forced to enact appropriate legislation. But it is evident that the American broadcasting system cannot long remain free if shackled by the tentacles of governmental program control. The Blue Book is just a beginning.'

DURR, CLIFFORD J., The Voice in Democracy, *Vital Speeches*, 14 (May 1, 1948).443-5.

The preservation of democracy 'depends in large part upon the role played by our instrumentalities of mass communications—how well they do the job of providing people with the information and ideas necessary for democratic decisions, and the freedom of circulation they grant to new ideas to deal with new problems.'

KALLER, ROBERT J., Radio Broadcasting in Canada, *Printer's Ink*, 220 (September 19, 1947). 48-9.

'Canada's system is based on publicly operated regional and national network service with privately owned local community service.' Kaller reviews the organization and programming aspects of Canadian radio.

KAPLON, MARTIN D., The Observational Method in Radio Audience Measurement, *The American Psychologist*, 2 (August, 1947).335.

The author condenses a study in which 145 students observed listening behavior of 254 radio listeners for a total of 7,620 minutes of radio listening. 'The results suggest "that the so-called coincidental method does not accurately reflect coincidental listening' and 'that tuning and listening behavior are different enough to cast some doubt on the validity of the A. C. Neilson Audimeter technique.'

LANDRY, ROBERT J., Radio Mexicano, *Printer's Ink*, 221 (December 12, 1947).66ff.

'Mexican radio, despite its recent expansion, is ten years behind American radio. . . . In many a radio station fixed schedules are as unknown as fixed rates. Not all programs begin or end on time, and not all radio studios have clocks. The guitar and the marimba reign supreme, monotonous but Mexican, and objectionable only because the musicians sometimes neglect to rehearse.' Landry reviews broadcasting practices in Mexico.

LAYBOURN, G. P., and H. P. LONGSTAFF, College Students' Opinions of Radio Advertising, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 32 (February, 1948).81-7.

The purpose of this study was to discover the likes and dislikes of college students for various types of radio advertising. The best liked, and the most disliked, classes of radio advertisements were those of the attention-getting commercials presented as jingles, slogans, and skits.

LUNDE, ANDERS S., The American Federation of Musicians and the Recording Ban, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 12 (Spring, 1948).45-56.

The controversy between the AFM and the radio and recording companies that resulted in the ban on recorded music is given dispassionate analysis.

MEYER, ARTHUR R., Radio Defamation: Neither Fish nor Fowl, *The Lawyer and Law Notes*, 2 (Winter, 1947-8).7-14.

The writer examines the law of defamation as it applies to broadcasts. He discusses slander, libel, absolute liability, and negligence.

SCHREIBER, FLORA RHETA, A New Generation of Radio Comedians, *Hollywood Quarterly*, 3 (Winter, 1947-8).129-39.

A critique of the humor of Jack Paar, Abe Burrows, and Robert Q. Lewis.

SCHUBERT, PAUL, A Radioman Looks at Radio, *Saturday Evening Post*, 220 (January 10, 1948). 26, 109-10.

A veteran news commentator writes that 'the American citizen is far from getting the incomparable treat that our better broadcasters pro-

fess to dish out' and that 'taken by and large, radio in the United States is dull, stereotyped, unimaginative and depressing.'

SIOUSSAT, HELEN J., Making Friends with the Microphone, *Dramatics*, 19 (March, 1948).5-6.

The director of radio talks for CBS offers specific advice on the composition and delivery of a radio speech.

Television! Boom! *Fortune*, 37 (May, 1948).79-83, 191ff.

'After long lurking in the wings, video has rushed to the center of the entertainment stage.' *Fortune's* staff review developments in the television industry.

THAYER, CHARLES W., Radio as an Instrument of Foreign Policy, *Vital Speeches*, 14 (March 1, 1948).309-12.

A State Department official discusses 'the ways by which the propagation by radio of straight fact can be exploited in the interests of international freedom and security.'

THURBER, JAMES, Onward and Upward with the Arts, *The New Yorker*, 24 (May 15, 1948).34-8ff.

'A soap opera is a kind of sandwich, whose recipe is simple enough, although it took years to compound. Between thick slices of advertising, spread 12 minutes of dialogue, add predicament, villainy, and female suffering in equal measure, throw in a dash of nobility, sprinkle with tears, season with organ music, cover with a rich announcer sauce, and serve five times a week.' Thurber presents the first of a series of articles on soap operas, discussing their origin and leading writers.

WILSON, ELMO C., The Effectiveness of Documentary Broadcasts, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 12 (Spring, 1948).19-29.

'At the same time that it has developed a series of documentary broadcasts, the Columbia Broadcasting System has endeavored to gauge the impact of these programs through the use of panels interviewed before and after the listening experience.' This is a report on CBS research activities with the documentary broadcasts.

WOLFE, CHARLES HULL, A Research-Suggested Approach to Radio Commercials, *Printer's Ink*, 222 (February 6, 1948).33-5, 60ff.

'Plan your commercials around the Law of Extremes, making them either so entertaining that they create an immediate pleasurable response or so forceful, aggressive and repetitious that they produce a momentarily unpleasant reaction.' On the basis of advertising research the author formulates four steps for the preparation of effective commercial copy.

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION

BARSHAY, BERNARD, Gordon Craig's Theories of Acting, *Theatre Annual*, Publication of the Theatre Library Association, New York, 6 (1947).55-63.

Barshay corrects the popular assumption that Craig was exclusively a stage designer by presenting Craig as a significant theorist in acting. Barshay, like Sheldon Cheney, takes the point of view that Craig 'influenced the world theatre more than any other artist in modern times' and that some of his important writing was on acting.

BENTLEY, ERIC, The American Theatre 1947-48, *Harper's*, 196 (March, 1948).232-40.

For the second year *Harper's* has invited Bentley to subject the current American theatre to penetrating analysis. Revival tendencies, adaptations, translations, new plays, experimentation, and current audiences are the topics he has chosen.

BERTENSSON, SERGEI, The Premiere of 'The Inspector General,' *Russian Review*, 7 (Autumn, 1947).88-95.

This brief, historical sketch of the origin and production of Gogol's immortal comedy, 'The Inspector General,' is reconstructed from Gogol's letters, memoirs, correspondence of contemporaries, and other documents.

BROWN, IVOR, The Theatre—Some of Our Conquerers, *Britain Today*, 145 (May, 1948).32-5.

The London stage today is dominated by American plays. These flourish in proportion to their Americanism. Even after the war Brown still finds 'the Stars and Stripes as a flag predominant in London's theatre quarter.'

DALRYMPLE, JEAN, Interview with Mr. Shaw, *Theatre Arts*, 32 (April-May, 1948).34-5.

George Bernard Shaw talks with Dalrymple about directing. A word on playwriting and an aside on women in positions of leadership find their way into the conversation.

DIETRICH, JOHN E., Recording Drama in Action, *Players*, 24 (April, 1948).148-9.

The University of Wisconsin is experimenting with recording all or parts of each production as it plays before its first, regular audience. Saving the performance for the future is only one objective; the more important is that of

studying audience reaction during the actual run of the play. Dietrich explains the values of his experiment.

FALLON, GABRIEL, One Man's Hamlet, *Irish Monthly*, 76 (May, 1948).228-33.

Fallon writes sentimental reminiscences on the 'Hamlet' of John Barrymore.

FULTON, A. R., A University Course in the Moving Pictures, *Hollywood Quarterly*, 3 (Winter, 1947-8).199-201.

Fulton describes the course in moving pictures that Purdue has recently established and presents some of the resulting problems.

GEDDES, NORMAN BEL, Flexible Theatre, *Theatre Arts*, 32 (June-July, 1948).48-9.

The designer, called by Howard Lindsay 'the man with the free-wheeling mind,' introduces 'some startling construction ideas' for theatre architecture. Drawings are included.

HIVNOR, MARY OTIS, Barrault and Artaud, *Partisan Review*, 15 (March, 1948).332-8.

'The theatre is the only institution in France which may be said to have benefited from the war.' Hivnor explains that this statement is true largely because of the dynamic anti-naturalistic innovations of two, great, young men of the theatre, Jean-Louis Barrault and Antonin Artaud.

LETTS, WINNIFRED, The Fays at the Abbey Theatre, *Fortnightly*, n.s.978 (June, 1948).420-23.

This is a sensitive bit of reminiscence concerning the theatre of the Irish Renascence with an unpublished letter on playwriting by William Butler Yeats thrown in for good measure.

LIST, KURT, Britten and Modern Opera, *Partisan Review*, 15 (July, 1948).822-5.

This critical article is of interest to those schools which use music drama as part of their dramatic fare. List explains the goals of Britten and their relation to natural speech.

LITTLEWOOD, S. R., Fifty Years of Criticism, *Drama*, n.s.8 (Spring, 1948).15-9.

The present editor of *The Stage*—and professional drama critic since the final decade of the last century—discusses the progress of journalistic theatre criticism during the last fifty years. Littlewood comments on leading critics, past and present, out of the experience of his own association with them and casts some light upon the change in critical function from the eighties to the present.

SCHNITZLER, HENRY, The Educational Theatre Faces a Challenge, *San Francisco Quarterly*, 13, No. 1 (1948).1-12.

Schnitzler discusses the over-centralization which characterizes American theatre and expresses dissatisfaction with the failure of educational theatres to remedy the situation. School theatres, according to one observer at least, 'are only links in a chain store which has its headquarters in New York City.'

SOUTHERN, RICHARD, Lediard and Early 18th-Century Scene Design, *Theatre Notebook*, 2 (April-June, 1948).49-54.

Lediard is the most informative witness on early 18th-century scenery. Here, along with Lediard's detailed comments and descriptions and some remarks by the author, are reproduced eight plates showing stage designs of the period.

SULLIVAN, EDWARD D., The Actors' Alceste: Evolution of the Misanthrope, *Modern Language Quarterly*, 9 (March, 1948).74-89.

There is abundance of material in which literary critics have analyzed the character of Molière's Alceste. Since the actor, no less than the professional literary critic, is required to interpret the work of a dramatic author, Sullivan examines the manner in which various actors have handled this role in 'The Misanthrope.'

Stratford-Upon-Avon Scene

This section takes the liberty of departing from its customary style to call attention to an informative and little-known, monthly magazine. As it contains no feature articles digests cannot be abstracted from it. Nevertheless, it is filled with tidbits of Shakespearean lore and news compiled on the scene at Stratford-upon-Avon (20 Chapel Street) where scholars and actors meet. One of this periodical's most interesting features is the abundance of photographs of current Shakespearean productions and of actors in costume and make-up.

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS

BEERY, ALTHEA, Oral Language and Inter-Group Harmony, *Elementary English*, 25 (March, 1948).161-73.

The barriers to the use of oral language for promoting inter-group harmony are: 1. the prejudices of teachers, 2. unfriendly attitudes toward groups acquired by children from parents and others, 3. the weight of tradition, 4. reluctance to deal with controversial issues, and 5. authoritarianism. Nevertheless, oral language can contribute much in the form of discussion, reading,

and conversation to harmonious, human relationships.

BETTS, EMMETT ALBERT, Reading: Language Arts Approach, *Educational Administration and Supervision*, 34 (February, 1948).65-94.

Listening, talking, reading, and writing are facets of language development. The entire language arts program can be utilized to develop reading ability. Thus, the instruction should be harmonized with the sequence of language development and should be paced by the child's language needs.

ELIASON, NORMAN E., Old English Vowel Lengthening and Vowel Shortening Before Consonant Groups, *Studies in Philology*, 45 (January, 1948).1-20.

Using historical phonology and experimental phonetics as tools to shape his evidence the author points out: 1. that vowel shortening occurs in dissyllables when consonants are heterosyllabic; that is, belonging to both syllables; 2. that vowel shortening does not occur when the consonants are tautosyllabic; that is, belonging to the same syllable. Monosyllabic changes are ascribed to the operation of analogy.

FUNKE, ERICH, Rebuilding a Practical Phonetics Laboratory, *The German Quarterly*, 21 (March, 1948).120-5.

This article describes the equipment that was required to refurnish a phonetics laboratory after the previous one had burned. Although primarily for foreign-language, phonetics training the descriptions and price tags of the equipment are valid for any phase of language phenomena. Technical data, trade names, and prices are quoted for all equipment listed.

GERBER, JOHN C., Testing and Evaluation in the Skills of Communication, *College English*, 9 (April, 1948).375-84.

The author details the program in communications at the University of Iowa and describes significant research in testing procedures. Objectivity is desired, but the testing program is not limited to strictly 'objective' procedures. The use of pre-testing clinical techniques is recommended. A final note indicates that students in the communications courses benefit almost equally in speech and in writing skills whether they are taught by speech instructors or by English instructors.

LABRANT, LOU, Words for Peace, *Education*, 68 (May, 1948).546-9.

The author pleads for more semantic training—especially for children. Proper use of language and meaning is necessary so that people of control and good will may act and think profitably.

MCMILLAN, JAMES B., A Philosophy of Language, *College English*, 9 (April, 1948).385-90.

A philosophy of language is postulated in an effort to convince teachers of English to follow the research and scholarship of the specialists in language. It is the job of the teacher to make statements about language which are true according to the speaker's definition of truth—either objective truth or subjective truth. Accepting these postulates the teacher should try for practical objectivity and should heal the breach between the scholars in language and the English teachers.

POLAK, VACLAV, (English version by Stuart E. Mann), Present-Day Trends in Soviet Linguistics, *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 26 (April, 1948).438-51.

This paper shows: 1. the relationship of Soviet linguistics to theories propounded by Nikolai Jakoolevic Marr, the proponent of 'japhetology'; 2. a trend for a broad treatment of linguistic questions of kinship; 3. the re-examination of old theories; and 4. the bold statement of new ideas. The author indicates that the linguistic pattern of the Soviet Union is tending to encourage the comparative study of the most heterogeneous language types and structures, and not 'one-language type' as fostered in non-Soviet, European linguistics.

POTTER, RALPH K., and GORDON E. PETERSON, The Representation of Vowels and Their Movements, *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 20 (July, 1948).528-35.

Portrayal of speech sounds in the patterns of visible speech offers new possibilities of quantitative analysis. The use of quantitative coordinate designations for varied speech sounds is proposed. The vowel bars, or formants, especially for the two lowest frequencies, are plotted against each other to provide the designation.

REICHLING, ANTON, What Is General Linguistics, 1 (Undated, probably late 1947).8-24.

This article indicates how General Linguistics aims at tracing and defining the universal categories of speech phenomena as well as the factors on which these categories depend. General Linguistics, while studying all that is systematic in speech and language, must extend the scope of its investigations to the diachronic or historic phenomena as well as to the synchronic phenomena.

SEASHORE, ROBERT H., The Importance of Vocabulary in Learning Language Skills, *Elementary English*, 25 (March, 1948).137-52.

A number of commonly accepted theories on vocabulary are held to be false. These newer word counts indicate: 1. that first-grade children know 1,000 words plus 7,000 derivatives, 2. that a child gains about 5,000 words per year, 3. that an adult's vocabulary increases in size up through the age of forty, and 4. that vocabulary size is probably the best single index for the prediction of all other language skills. Re-evaluation in the fields of language development is indicated.

STOAKES, JAMES PAUL, English—*the* One World Language, *Education*, 68 (May, 1948).555-9.

A plea for English as an auxiliary language is the theme of this article. The author points out the benefit of starting with a language that has 400 million speakers and a simple grammatical structure. He decries the perverse spelling and pronunciation that hinders the adoption of English.

WILSON, JANE, Unaccustomed As I Am, *American Foreign Service Journal*, 28 (July, 1948). 14ff.

The managing editor of this journal advocates training in speech for employees in our Foreign Service and State Department. A particular need is instruction to emphasize 'the effective communication of an effective person.' The article makes clear that ability in speech might mean 'a choice between effective support of the national interest or careless damage to our representation and prestige.'

SPEECH SCIENCE

AMERICAN STANDARD LETTER SYMBOLS FOR PHYSICS, *American Journal of Physics*, 16 (March, 1948).164-79.

The list of symbols presented here by the Committee on Letter Symbols will soon be designated as the American Standard by the ASA.

ANGEVINE, O. L., JR., and R. S. ANDERSON, The Problem of Sound Distribution, *Audio Engineering*, 32 (June, 1948).18-23.

'The person who is facing his first sound distribution problems usually is overawed by the apparent complexity of a job involving the choice of speakers, their location, and the determination of audio power requirements.' In this first of a series the authors present specific information on these and kindred points.

BEKESY, GEORG V., On the Elasticity of the Cochlear Partition, *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 20 (May, 1948).227-41.

'A number of special techniques are described which are necessary in preparing the cochlea. Using these, the elasticity of the cochlear portion is determined as a function of locus along the canal. It is demonstrated that the production of undertones is very improbable because of the form of vibration in the cochlear partition and because the basilar membrane possesses no inherent stress.'

BERRY, GORDON, Hearing Aids, *The Annals of Otology, Rhinology, and Laryngology*, 57 (June, 1948).483-8.

Presented here is an easily read discussion of post-war improvements in hearing aids. The brief descriptions of technical changes—as mercury batteries, miniature tubes, printed circuits, and microphone and receiver developments—will interest clinical and non-clinical readers.

BOMBERGER, DAVID C., Loudness Control for Reproducing Systems, *Audio Engineering*, 32 (May, 1948).11-2, 36, 38.

Described by a Bell engineer is a loudness control—based on Fletcher-Munson curves—that automatically maintains reasonably constant tonal balance at all intensity levels.

BROOKS, C. MCC., and J. C. ECCLES, An Analysis of Synaptic Excitatory Action, *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 11 (July, 1948).365-76.

This article presents a detailed analysis of the interaction between two monosynaptic reflexes from synergic muscles. The authors suggest that the observations reported 'have been explained in terms of the recent electrical hypothesis of synaptic transmission, which thus receives substantial experimental support.'

CORLISS, EDITH L. R., and G. S. COOK, A Cavity Pressure Method for Measuring the Gain of Hearing Aids, *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 20 (March, 1948).131-6.

'The gain of a hearing aid can be measured by a cavity pressure technique. The chief advantages of the method are its compactness and simplicity. Results of measurements are equal in validity to those obtained by the more familiar free field method.'

CURRAN, GEORGE W., An Artificial Reverberation System, *Audio Engineering*, 32 (May, 1948).13-7, 45-6.

Described is 'a simple, practical system for producing controlled reverberation,' using 'a

long pipe with a loudspeaker at one end and a microphone at the other.'

DENSLOW, J. S., Double Discharges in Human Motor Units, *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 11 (May, 1948).209-15.

Denslow reports studies demonstrating that 'in the intact human, mechanisms exist which permit motor units to discharge twice within a few msec., with a succeeding latent period of considerable duration.'

JONES, MARVIN F., Discussion of Present Methods for Testing Auditory Function, *The Annals of Otology, Rhinology, and Laryngology*, 59 (June, 1948).311-23.

Jones stresses the point of view that some of our errors in diagnosis are caused by our acceptance of time-honored, unproved theories [of hearing mechanisms] as facts. A meticulous review of all experiments on which our present diagnostic methods are based should be a continuing effort.'

JOOS, MARTIN, Acoustic Phonetics, *Supplement to Language*, 24, No. 2, Suppl. (April-June, 1948).5-136.

'This book is not, as its title may seem to indicate, an authoritative survey of an established science. Acoustic phonetics is now in its infancy.' But Joos has seen and met the necessity 'to initiate the discussion of acoustic phonetics among linguists with a survey which 1. includes at least the bare essentials of acoustic theory and sound-perception theory, and 2. presents a sampling of the kinds of phonetic argument that can be developed by discussing speech-sound data in the light of well-established principles.'

KOBRAK, H. G., Construction Material of the Sound Conduction System of the Human Ear, *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 20 (March, 1948).125-30.

Kobrak points out that the behavior of the living, elastic bodies in the ear must be studied for full understanding of the ear as a sound conductor and distinguishes three areas in the ear according to their construction material.

POHLMAN, MAX, The Acoustic Probe, *Annals of Otology, Rhinology, and Laryngology*, 57 (June, 1948).483-8.

Pohlman further discusses diagnostic functions of the acoustic probe.

POLLACK, IRWIN, Effects of High Pass and Low Pass Filtering on the Intelligibility of Speech in Noise, *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 20 (May, 1948).259-66.

'It was found that the relative contribution of the various speech frequencies was not constant, but rather was a function of the intensity of the speech signal relative to the constant white noise masking signal.'

SAVAGE, E. W., Telephone Recording, *Audio Engineering*, 32 (April, 1948).20-3, 36-7.

In an analysis of the problems raised in telephone recording Savage suggests that in 'the structural analysis of fundamental speech sounds it might also be helpful to explore a new approach. Suggesting that, in addition to the importance of the distrbution of energy by sound frequency bands, of considerable significance 'are the orders of sequence and timing with which the respective frequency components of a speech sound are initiated, or reach their peak amplitude or decay.'

WEVER, GLEN ERNEST, MERLE LAWRENCE, and KENDON R. SMITH, The Effects of Negative Air Pressure in the Middle Ear, *Annals of Otology, Rhinology, and Laryngology*, 57 (June, 1948).418-28.

The authors describe experiments performed on cats that made use of the electrical potentials of the cochlea to show how the acoustic efficiency of the ear is affected by pressure changes. In general, the effects of negative and positive pressure changes in the middle ear are similar. They conclude that a 'decrease in the air pressure of the middle ear cavity usually results in a reduction in the electrical responses of the cochlea.'

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH

ALICIA, SISTER M.R.S.M., Debating in Junior High Schools, *The Catholic School Journal*, 48 (June, 1948).211-2.

The author advocates formal debating in the junior high school as a means of broadening the student's general knowledge and as a means of deepening his convictions.

AXELRAD, JOSEPH, The Technique of 'Group Discussion' in the College Class, *The Journal of General Education*, 2 (April, 1948).227-37.

The author briefly examines four patterns of 'discussion' as used in college classes—lecturette, recitation, group conversation, and group discussion. These four general patterns are evaluated with respect to how they promote general education. The first three named are found to lack the essentials of 'good' discussion. Only group discussion is recommended as a truly effective device to accomplish the ends for which each is intended.

CROCKER, LIONEL, Extracurricular Perceptions—Value of Public Speaking and Debate, *Vital Speeches*, 14 (May, 1948).447-8.

Public speaking and debate assist the student to become a more effective member of society because through these activities he learns such things as: the meaning of convictions, the nature and importance of fair play, the evaluation of ideas, the best use of words, and the dissemination of truth.

KLEE, LORETTA, Study and Discussion Groups for Teachers in Service, *New York State Education*, 35 (February, 1948).338, 443.

'For the teacher in the classroom, in-service study and discussion groups are a supplement to, rather than a substitute for, university courses.'

LOCHHEAD, CHARLOTTE, Public Relations and Adult Education, *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 22 (March, 1948).514-7.

Discussion groups are playing a major role in unifying our nation because they help people in knowing and understanding one another. The library acts as a central clearing house to render needed services in the improvement of public relations through group discussions.

MCKENZIE, RUTH, Community Action Through Farm Forums, *The Canadian Forum*, 28(June, 1948).59-60.

The author describes how groups of farm people in Ontario have learned to work together through the use of forums.

PAINTER, MARGARET, Improving Methods of Teaching Speech, *The English Journal*, 37 (March, 1948).133-8.

The author maintains that English teachers should be educated to appreciate the values in speech training in order to insure that this universally used communication skill is taught. Thus oral work will assume its proper place in the classroom.

ZELKO, HAROLD P., Speech Training in Industry, *The Journal of Industrial Training*, 2(March-April, 1948).9-14.

'The place of speech and oral communication in this general picture of management and employee development is the basic consideration of this article.'

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

BETTS, EMMETT ALBERT, Remedial and Corrective Reading: Content Area Approval, *Education* 68 (June, 1948).579-95.

The development sequence of speech, reading, and writing is described. There is a 'ready' period for each of the phenomena, and any deviation from the proper time, or a change in sequence, is frustrating and detrimental.

COLE, EDWIN, Boston Rehabilitation Symposium, *Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation*, 27 (April, 1948).80-1.

No two aphasiacs are alike. However, speech therapy and therapy for reintegration to normal life are almost universally given. Some mental deterioration comes with aphasia especially in non-veteran cases. Although both aphasic and cerebral palsy patients have speech and motor disorders their therapy is not similar.

CONWAY, HERBERT, One-Stage Push-back Operation for Congenital Insufficiency of the Palate, *Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, and Oral Pathology*, 1 (July, 1948).640-5.

A modification of Brown's, one-stage, push-back technique is described. The goal of the modification is to correct for the interference with nerve and blood supply inherent in the Brown technique. A bit of hard palate is chiseled away to free trunk nerves and arteries. In sixteen such operations eleven patients acquired normal speech after speech training.

DAVISON, A. H., The Relationship Between Unimanual and Bimanual Handedness, *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 38 (June, 1948).276-83.

On basis of unimanual handedness questionnaire, twenty-five highly right-handed and twenty-five highly left-handed students were selected in an attempt to determine the degree to which highly right- and left-handed persons could be differentiated with respect to modes of performing twenty specified bimanual activities. Results indicate that certain bimanual performances serve to differentiate unimanually right- and left-handed persons at the two per cent confidence level. All operations of four of the bimanual activities significantly differentiated between the two groups.

EVERHART, MERRIL W., Acute Laryngotracheobronchitis, *International Medical Digest*, 53 (July, 1948).50-3.

In this description and discussion of respiratory infections in which laryngeal symptoms occurred Everhart described acute laryngotracheobronchitis and the difficulty of differentiating it from simple catarrhal laryngitis, laryngeal dyphtheria, and the introduction of foreign bodies in the tract, as well as pneumonia or

asthma. Care of the infant is discussed together with the results of the disease which range from a mild inflammation to exceptionally severe cases resulting in tracheotomy.

HAAS, LOUIS J., Obesrvations on Left Handedness, *Mental Hygiene*, 32 (April, 1948).279-84.

Observations show that within limitations the development of individual handedness patterns depends on environment and tradition. Changes should be initiated before habits are too well established. Need for change in handedness must be recognized by the patient, and success depends on his desire to accomplish it. The change must not be accompanied with any emotional pressures or traumatic experiences.

HARRIS, HERBERT H., M.D., Benign Lesions of the True Vocal Cords, *The Annals of Otology, Rhinology and Laryngology*, 57 (March, 1948). 189-95.

A brief résumé of the anatomy of the true vocal cords, and their role in speech production is given. Deep removal of benign growths will permanently damage the voice and throw extra strain on the thyro-artenoid muscle. All benign growths should be removed. Some specific operative techniques which will not injure normal tissue are discussed. In most cases the patient should recover normal voice.

HILDRETH, GERTRUDE, Manual Dominance in Nursery School Children, *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 12 (March, 1948).29-45.

Recent observations of pre-school children seem to indicate that the child inherits capacity for dominance in either hand. Right-handed cultures make most people right-handed. A review of the studies of Giesecke, Heinlein, and Updegraff is presented. Scales, charts, and methods of testing forty-four pre-school children of Manhattanville Day Nursery in New York are included. It was found that the methods used in shifting were more important than the shift.

LARSON, LAILA I., and EARL R. TRUAX, Help for Those Who Cannot Hear, *The School Executive*, 67 (March, 1948).39-40.

An account is given of the first year of the mobile hearing clinic established by the Minnesota Society for Crippled Children and Adults in cooperation with the University of Minnesota.

MACFARLAN, DOUGLAS, Problems of the Congenitally Deaf Child, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 137 (June, 1948).774-5.

The child deaf before the age of two does not learn speech. As no provision now exists for handling these children before the age of six, psychologic variations and attention deafness become fixed. Most of these children can be taught to understand the spoken word by hearing amplified sound and can be taught to speak intelligibly. It is highly advisable to prepare these children to enter schools for children with normal hearing, avoiding institutionalization if possible.

PHELPS, WINTHROP M., Characteristic Psychological Variations in Cerebral Palsy, *The Nervous Child*, 7 (January, 1948).10-3.

The basic fact to be kept in mind in cerebral palsy cases is that desire to walk, to use the hands, or to speak must not be assumed. The goals set up must be partial ones, each of which the child can attain progressively.

PHELPS, WINTHROP M., Let's Define Cerebral Palsy, *The Crippled Child*, 26 (June, 1948).4-7.

Cerebral palsy is broken down into five general types which include spastic paralysis, athetosis, ataxia, rigidity, and tremor. Each is briefly defined. The need for 'team' method in treatment is stressed.

ROSS, HATTIE B., and J. H. MUYSKENS, Unto the Third and Fourth Generations, *Journal of Home Economics*, 40 (April, 1948).178-9.

The effects of gestational poisoning on the ability of offsprings (rats) are discussed. The close relationship between speech and certain vegetative muscular acts leads the authors to speculate concerning the incidence of speech defects in the generation born in 1965 of parents who today are children damaged by starvation, bombing fright, and similar experiences.

SMITH, ALATHENA J., and FERN MCGRATH, Parent Education and Group Therapy, *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 3 (July, 1948).214-7.

The authors report a meeting of parents at which the problem of one of the parents was solved by the participation of the whole group. This report indicates that it is necessary to bring one's feelings out in the open and express them before group therapy can take place.

STEIN, LEOPOLD, A Note on the Treatment of Stammering, *The British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 21 (March, 1948).121-6.

From the psychoanalytical point of view the author discusses the etiological factors in stuttering, taking exception to certain details in the theories of others who favor that general approach. The author believes that the develop-

mental stages of each case must be uncovered and analyzed in therapy.

STEIN, MORRIS I., Visual Aids in Group Psychotherapy for Veterans with Psychosomatic Complaints, *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 4 (April, 1948).206-11.

Stein describes the successful use of visual aids in group therapy with patients having psychosomatic symptoms. Pictures were substituted for words which veterans could not use author states they aided in objectifying the to explain their feelings to the therapist. Pictures were described in some detail; and the veteran's problems and thus moved him toward a more normal attitude.

TRUEX, EDWARD, JR., Boston Rehabilitation Symposium, *Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation*, 27 (April, 1948).86-8.

Dr. Truex comments on the jobs that are contraindicated for the hard of hearing person.

NEWS AND NOTES

ROBERT F. RAY, *Editor*

PLANS AND PROGRESS

At Brigham Young University: Three courses have been added in the radio division to prepare students for examinations for radio-telephone licenses, second- and first-class.

At DePauw University: Fifty-three people came to the tryouts for the Radio Workshop with the hope of participating in experimental productions. Over one hundred students attended the initial tryouts for the Radio Guild, an organization that weekly sponsors one, live, air show. DePauw University has applied for and is awaiting official notification to begin broadcasting on the new, 110 watt, low-power, FM station. DePauw Speech Department has formed a 'traveling radio show' organization which plans to secure air time on nearby radio stations. It is expected that in this manner more students may receive experience and at the same time render a very real service to the surrounding low-power stations.

At the University of Oklahoma: The Department of Speech has moved into new quarters which provide specialized facilities for all phases of speech. Especially noteworthy are the four large, air-conditioned studios for radio work and the soundproof and sound-treated rooms for the use of the Speech and Hearing Clinic. Nine full-time, staff members and several assistants are now employed in the two branches of the Speech and Hearing Clinic, one branch of which is located in the School of Medicine in Oklahoma City; the other branch is located on the Norman campus.

At Stanford University: The late Charles Field, prominent Stanford alumnus, known to the nation as 'Cheerio' left to Stanford University a substantial sum, the interest from which is to be used by the Department of Speech and Drama for the establishing of scholarships and fellowships in the field of drama. These are to be known as 'The Field-Hotaling Scholarships and Fellowships.'

At Texas Christian University: The Speech Division announces the organization of a Student Speakers Bureau, under the direction of John Shirley, a graduate student in the department. The service will include four phases: Student Speakers, One-Act Plays, Readings and Book Reviews, and Discussion and Debate. The Radio Division has completed arrangements for a campus radio station to go into operation on October 20. Plans for the station were the results of deliberations by a campus radio committee composed of the deans of all colleges, department heads, and student representatives. The station will employ five watts of power and will send its signal over the college power line. A potential listening audience of 1,000 to 1,200 students will be within the range of the station.

The Texas Christian University chapter of Pi Kappa Delta is sponsoring a national, recorded, debate tournament. Sixteen schools have been invited to participate—these chosen from the thirty-two schools represented at the West Point Tournament in the spring of 1948. Each school participating will enter three affirmative and three negative teams. Four twelve-minute constructive recordings and two five-minute, rebuttal recordings will be made for each debate. The debates will be judged by non-competing schools. Coaches interested in hearing complete recordings of any of these debates may secure them after January first from E. L. Pross of the T. C. U. Speech-Drama Department.

APPOINTMENTS

At the University of Arizona: Lila Sands, first vice-president of Zeta Phi Eta, directed interpretation courses during the first semester. Miss Sands has nearly completed her work for the doctorate at the University of Wisconsin. During the second semester Ruth P. Kentzler, assistant professor of speech at the University of Hawaii, will be on the speech faculty.

At Brigham Young University: Jim H. Ludlow, as an instructor in radio to coordinate activities between faculty and students for station KBYU of the IBS network. Robert Kest has been added as instructor in public speaking and dramatic arts. Kest speaks the Dutch language fluently and wrote his Master's thesis on 'The Golden Age of Dutch Drama.'

At Cornell University: C. S. Angell, formerly of the University of Illinois, as an instructor in public speaking; R. V. Holland, formerly of the Michigan State faculty, as a teaching fellow in public speaking; Wiliam A. Jewett, Jr., previously at Dartmouth, as a teaching and technical director of the Cornell University Theatre; A. H. Bernstein and Brice Howard as assistants in public speaking; Lois Conway and Janet Sepersky as assistants in the Speech Clinic; and Martha Murrell and Susan Redman as asistants on the Cornell Theatre staff.

At Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina: McDonald Held, formerly of Northwestern State College of Louisiana, as instructor in the School of Speech.

At Michigan State College: Charles Gaupp, Jr., has been named designer and production director for the Michigan State Theatre. For the past year Mr. Gaupp has been an instructor at the State University of Iowa. He holds a Bachelor's dergree from the University of California and a Master's degree from Cornell University.

At Northwestern State College of Louisiana: Irma Stockwell, formerly associated with the University of Wisconsin and with Mary Baldwin College, as assistant professor of speech. Miss Stockwell will be in charge of the Speech Clinic and of classes in speech correction. She will also serve as consultant to elementary school teachers in northern Louisiana parishes.

At the University of Oklahoma: John W. Keltner, associate professor of speech, recently of Iowa State Teachers College, has assumed the duties formerly performed by William M. Sattler who has accepted a position at the University of Michigan. Dorothy Friend has been appointed an instructor in speech and director of forensics. Miss Friend was formerly an instructor in speech at Missouri University. June Miller has been named an assistant professor of speech (Auditory Training Teacher). Miss Miller has been working with the Lexington School for the Deaf in New York City. Donald Harrington has been appointed assistant professor of speech and will teach the voice science course.

At Pennsylvania State College: Paul Rensselaer Beall has been appointed associate professor of speech at Pennsylvania State College. He has recently been made chairman of the committee appointed to formulate and administer the curriculum in Labor-Management Relations for the School of Liberal Arts.

At Stanford University: Stanley Donner, formerly associated with the Radio Division of Northwestern University, has been appointed assistant professor in charge of Stanford radio programs. Dalford Brummer has been named technical director in the Department of Speech and Drama. New teaching assistants include James Egbert, Marion Gaber, David M. Grant, Clifford Hamar, David S. Hawes, and Howard W. Runkel. James Gordon Emerson will act as director of debate; he will relieve Leland Chapin during his quarter on leave and will give Dr. Chapin more time to devote to the development of a graduate program in rhetoric and public address. William D. Lucas is acting as director of freshman debate.

At Texas Christian University: Frederick B. Folks has been appointed to head the Radio Division of the Speech-Drama Department. Mr. Folks was formerly director of Radio Activities at Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois. He is a veteran of thirteen years in commercial radio and during the war served as a radio writer and producer for the Army Bureau of Public Relations.

At the University of Virginia: Douglas Ehninger, formerly of Ohio State University, has joined the staff of the School of Speech.

ON THE STAGES

At Brigham Young University: The play schedule this year includes two original productions as well as the Indian classic 'Shakuntala.' Margaret Webster brought both 'Macbeth' and 'Hamlet' to the campus. Other plays being presented are 'Dream Girl,' 'The Three Y's Men,' 'I Remember Mama,' 'You Can't Take It with You,' 'Whole World Over,' and 'The Fortune Hunter.'

At Cornell University: Plays given this term included 'You Touched Me' by Tennessee Williams and Donald Windham and 'The Barretts of Wimpole Street.' In December, the Cornell Dramatic Club will present 'Arsenic and Old Lace' by Joseph Kesselring and the 'Second Shepherd's Play.'

At the University of Delaware: The E52 Players opened their season with the presentation of 'The Man in the Bowler Hat' for the benefit of incoming freshmen. First major production of the year was 'Mary of Scotland.' The Players have established a new type of program called a Laboratory Theatre, designed primarily for trying out new talent, new staging techniques,

and new plays. The first program consisted of 'Speaking Terms,' 'Balcony Scene,' and a scene from 'The Roof.' The casts were entirely made up of students who had not taken major roles in previous E52 plays. Directors were students from the class in directing. Admission was by invitation. After each performance an open discussion of the plays was held. Miss Kay Poulton, secretary to the member of the Arts Council of Great Britain in charge of theatre activity, visited the University in November and delivered an afternoon lecture on 'The Old Vic.'

At DePauw University: Four productions are being given at DePauw this year, one of which will be a musicale. The first play given was 'Mrs. January and Mr. Ex,' a comedy by Zoe Akins.

At Northwestern State College of Louisiana: During the summer of 1948, the first Summer Theatre Workshop Program was held. Twenty students from six states were enrolled for the nine-hour credit course which included work in all phases of theatre operation. Seven plays were presented during the nine-week session. These included: 'The Family Upstairs,' 'Bertha,' 'The Beautiful Typewriter Girl,' 'The Ghost of a Chance,' 'Applesauce,' 'Stairs of Sand,' 'Tiger House,' and 'Blossom in November.' Three of the productions were given from manuscripts. One of them, 'The Ghost of a Chance,' was given as a tryout for a Chicago publisher; and two, 'Blossom in November' and 'Stairs of Sand,' were first productions of the AETA Manuscript Play Project. In October, the College Theatre produced 'Madame Ada' and W. Fredric Plette directing and Robert B. Capel serving as technical director. In November, the play 'Trouble Shooter' was produced.

At Stanford University: The Theatre Schedule offers 'Othello,' 'The Relapse,' 'The Return of Peter Grimm,' and the West Coast première of the opera 'Schwanda, the Bagpiper.'

At Texas Christian University: The Drama Division of the Speech-Drama Department is presenting five major productions during the 1948-9 season: 'First Lady,' 'Antigone,' 'The Male Animal,' 'Ghosts,' and 'The Glass Menagerie.' Walther Volbach and Andrea Hetzel are directing all the productions. Admittance to plays has been made a part of student activity fees, and all plays will run four nights to accommodate the student body. Studio performances presently scheduled include 'Happy Journey,' 'Overtones,' 'Hello Out There,' and scenes from 'Liliom.' These will be produced and directed by graduate students in drama.

AT THE MEETINGS

On October 29, 1948, the Ohio Conference for Speech Education was held at the Fort Hayes Hotel, Columbus. The organizations which cooperated in the conference were the Ohio Association of Speech and Hearing Therapists, the Ohio Association of Secondary Teachers of Speech, the Ohio Association of College Teachers of Speech, and the Ohio High School Speech League. George A. Kopp, professor of speech at Wayne University and secretary-treasurer of the American Speech and Hearing Association, addressed the general session. Congressman Karl Mundt of South Dakota, president of the National Forensics League, was the speaker at the conference luncheon. Charlotte B. Chorpenning, of the Goodman Theatre, Chicago Art Institute, spoke at the general session on creative dramatics. Among those who participated on the programs of the sectional meetings were J. Jeffery Auer, Oberlin College; John W. Black, Kenyon College; Stanley Boylan, Central High School, Lima; T. C. Bond, McKinley High School, Niles; Dana T. Burns, Baldwin-Wallace College; Lionel Crocker, Denison University; Warren A. Guthrie, Western Reserve University; Florence Hill, Lehman High School, Canton; James N. Holm, Kent State University; Ruth Beckey Irwin, State Department of Education; A. C. LaFollette, Ohio University; C. R. Layton, Muskingum College; John M. Martin, Oakwood High School, Dayton; Brother Charles Rossman, S. M., Purcell High School, Cincinnati; C. P. Smith, Newark High School; Loren C. Staats, Ohio University; Stanley Ainsworth, Paul A. Carmack, Franklin Knower, Hugh Laughlin, Richard Mall, Keith I. Tyler, William Utterback, Earl Wiley, and W. Hayes Yeager of Ohio State University.

MacMurray College at Jacksonville, Illinois, held an Arts Conference on November 4, 5, and 6 with outstanding persons in the fields of art, drama, and music participating. Two hundred members of the Illinois Speech Association attended. Robert Edmond Jones, America's foremost scene designer, spoke on the topic, 'Why Do We Have Theatres?' Mr. Jones is noted for his work in the original production of Eugene O'Neill's early plays; and in late years, for his work in the Central City, Colorado, summer productions.

The Ninth Delaware Dramatic Conference was held at the University of Delaware on Saturday,

November 6. The principal speaker was Basil Langton, prominent British director and actor, who spoke on the English theatre outside of London. Another feature of the program was a discussion of the personality factors needed to make a good actor by Joseph Zimmerman of the Department of Radio, Speech, and Theatre at Temple University. Professor Zimmerman has just completed an exhaustive study of this subject based on examinations and personal interviews with the best actors in some of our leading university theatres. The conference also included technical discussions and demonstrations (lighting and make-up), and panels on the school theatre, community theatre, college theatre, and children's theatre.

The speech program in South Dakota is due for a lift this year at SDEA in Aberdeen. Plans are being made to have a discussion by a panel composed of several college and university professors of speech. The discussion will center around the question of what preparation in speech should precede college study. Harold M. Jordan of the University of South Dakota will act as moderator. Ray DeBoer of Dakota Wesleyan University and Alphus Christensen of South Dakota State College are two members of the panel; other members have not been definitely determined. Following the discussion, L. M. Fort, Superintendent of Schools at Sioux Falls, will speak briefly on what the colleges and universities in the state can do to assist secondary education with respect to the speech and the speech training of teachers. Another feature of SDEA will be the Speech Round Table; invitations to attend are being sent to all schools of the state, particularly to the small schools. This invitation is also being extended to administrators and social science teachers as well as English teachers of the small school where no full time speech instructor is employed. The hope is that these representatives will see the value of broadening our speech program in the state by entering their schools actively into discussion tournaments in the state; the belief is that the social science teacher or the English teacher, who is best able to make the preparation for such discussions in her regular class work, can bring the standard of secondary speech education to a much higher level than it now attains. It is almost universally true among the small schools of the state that speech education, as a regular course in the curriculum, is nowhere in evidence; as an extracurricular activity, the best work has been done in the field of declamation.

(Reported by A. P. Schenk, Yankton Public Schools.)

The annual drama festival with the Utah High School Activities Association will be held at Brigham Young University in March.

PERSONAL NOTES

Raymond H. Barnard, assistant coordinator of basic communication at the University of Denver, has been promoted from assistant professor to associate professor. Professor Barnard is associate chairman of speech for the university, and he is also in charge of speech at the Civic Center campus.

W. Arthur Cable, head of the Department of Speech at the University of Arizona, was awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Denver at the close of the summer quarter. His major work was taken in the School of Speech there, with a concentration in speech and hearing pathology. His dissertation was written on the results of two years of experimentation in acoustic stimulation and is entitled 'An Experimental Investigation into Acoustic Stimulation as a Therapeutic Method for Deaf Children and Adolescents.'

Harry Caplan from Cornell University, Cornelius Cunningham from San Diego State College, and Mrs. Fairfax P. Walkup from the University of Arizona were visiting professors at Stanford University during the summer term.

Giraud Chester of Cornell University traveled through western and central Europe this summer; and he spent several weeks in London gathering materials on British broadcasting.

Lionel Crocker, Denison University, is the author of a speech text, *Effective Speaking*, written for the American Banking Institute. The book becomes the official teaching guide for classes in public speaking which the Institute promotes in various cities throughout the country.

Curnel Hampton, who has supervised the business speaking work at Michigan State College, has left his position to accept a commission as lieutenant colonel in the United States Army. He has been appointed to General Bradley's staff in Washington, D. C.

Elbert W. Harrington, formerly professor of speech and head of the Department of Speech, Radio, and Dramatic Art at the University of South Dakota, is now dean of the Liberal Arts School at the university.

Hubert C. Heffner, executive head of the Department of Speech and Drama, was visiting

professor at Cornell University during the summer session where he taught courses in modern drama in the English Department. Professor Heffner also gave lectures at the University of Michigan and at Ohio State University.

Harold M. Jordan, formerly professor of speech at Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, is now professor of speech at the University of South Dakota, Vermillion, South Dakota. In addition to his other duties at the university he is also editor of the *South Dakota Speech Bulletin.*

William Lewis, Jr., completed his Master's degree in radio at Northwestern University and has gone to Ohio University to teach and to work on his doctorate. His thesis consisted of thirteen dramatic skits taken from materials in 'The Book of Mormon.'

Alonzo J. Morley of Brigham Young University goes to Hawaii to spend the year in speech correction; and Loren Jex has been assigned to take up that subject in Dr. Morley's absence.

D. W. Morris, professor of speech and director of the Speech Clinic at Ohio State University, has assumed the presidency of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.

Donn O'Meara, graduate student at the University of Denver, has been awarded the Sigmund Livingston Fellowship by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith of New York City in order to activate and evaluate a new evening curriculum in intercultural relations at the University of Denver. Mr. O'Meara has been appointed coordinator for the course which is being jointly supervised by Arthur Campa, chairman of the Division of Humanities, and Elwood Murray, director of the School of Speech, University of Denver. An advisory committee composed of leaders in work related to intercultural problems has been appointed from the Denver community. The course which runs through two years is organized on a problem-solving sequence. A combination of communication methodologies, including group dynamics, sociodrama, and general semantics, are being integrated into the course.

W. Fredric Plette of Northwestern State College of Louisiana has been appointed review editor of *Players Magazine* for the coming year.

George F. Sparks, instructor in speech in the University of Arizona, pursued a doctoral program at Stanford University this past summer; and Lionel R. Scott, instructor in speech at the same institution, worked on his doctorate at the University of Southern California.

A. Nicholas Vardac was guest director at Camden Hills Theatre in Camden, Maine, during the summer where he directed 'John Loves Mary' and 'There's Always Juliet.'

Charles E. Weniger, for many years chairman of the English and Speech Department, Pacific Union College, and more recently dean of that college, is now dean and professor of speech and homiletics in The Seventh-Day Adventist Theological Seminary, Washington, D. C. Dean Weniger completed his doctoral requirements with a major in speech and a minor in comparative literature at the University of Southern California and was granted his doctorate in June.

H. A. Wichelns, chairman, and H. D. Albright are on sabbatical leave from Cornell University for the first term; and C. K. Thomas is acting chairman.

SUSTAINING MEMBERS

of

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

ALABAMA

ALBERT BIENERT, University of Alabama
MARY E. COMPTON, Alabama College
NANCY J. FORD, Walker College
MARIAN GALLAWAY, University of Alabama
ELLEN-HAVEN GOULD, Alabama College
T. EARLE JOHNSON, University of Alabama
JOSEPH H. MAHAFFEY, Alabama Polytechnic Institute
CHARLES E. PORTERFIELD, Birmingham Southern College
LESTER RAINES, Montgomery
W. R. RUCKER, USAF Special Staff School, Craig Field

ARIZONA

W. ARTHUR CABLE, University of Arizona
KLONDA LYNN, University of Arizona
MARY K. SANDS, University of Arizona

ARKANSAS

VIRGIL L. BAKER, University of Arkansas
THOMAS E. BOONE, College of The Ozarks
GENEVA EPPES, Hendrix College, Conway
M. BLAIR HART, University of Arkansas
THOMAS L. HEADLEY, Henderson State Teachers College
KATHERINE SCOTT, Little Rock
LEONA SCOTT, Arkansas State Teachers College
JACK L. SIGMAN, University of Arkansas
TOMMY E. STARCHER, University of Arkansas

CALIFORNIA

MARTIN P. ANDERSEN, University of California
VIRGIL A. ANDERSON, Stanford University
JAMES W. ANGWIN, Ventura Union Jr. High School
JOSEPH H. BACCUS, University of Redlands
J. RICHARD BIETRY, East Los Angeles City College
MARGARET G. BLACKBURN, University of California
PAUL F. BLACKBURN, Loyola University of Los Angeles
HELENE BLATTNER, Stanford University
ERVING M. BLUM, University of California at Berkeley
LUCILE M. BRADY, San Jose State College
VERNA BREINHOLT, Orange County Schools
FLEDA BRIGHAM, College of The Pacific
LAUREN L. BRINK, San Francisco State College
WAYNE BRITTON, San Francisco State College
ALICE C. CHAPIN, Los Angeles City Schools
LELAND T. CHAPIN, Stanford University
JAMES H. CLANCY, San Jose State College
ROBERT L. CLARK, Santa Barbara College
MRS. W. L. COFFEY, San Diego
CORNELIUS C. CUNNINGHAM, San Diego State College
JOSEPHINE DAVIS, Fairfax High School, Los Angeles
MILTON DICKENS, University of Southern California
JAMES H. EGBERT, Stanford Village, Stanford
NORMAN WILLIAM FREESTONE, Occidental College
FRANCIS T. GIBSON, University of S. California
HUGH W. GILLIS, San Jose State College
DAVID M. GRANT, Stanford University
JOHN A. GRASHAM, Los Angeles City College
DONALD C. GREEN, Camino College
ALTA B. HALL, University of Southern California
J. MARIAN HAMMOND, Pasadena City College
DONALD E. HARGIS, Univ. of California at L. A.
TREVOR L. HAWKINS, Los Angeles
MARGARET F. HILL, Lincoln School, Santa Barbara
PAUL D. HOLTZMAN, San Francisco State College
CHARLES V. HUME, Palo Alto
FRANCES C. HUNTE, Garvey School District
MORRIS VAL JONES, Santa Ana City Schools
DOROTHY KAUCHER, San Jose State College
CARROLL P. LAHMAN, Pasadena College
FRANK M. LASSMAN, University of S. California
MARGARET C. LEFEVRE, Kabat-Kaiser Institute
EVELYN STARR LESLIE, Westmont College, Santa Barbara
RICHARD LEWIS, Pacific Union College
HEROLD LILLYWHITE, Whittier College
CHARLES F. LINDSLEY, Occidental College
CHARLES W. LOMAS, Univ. of Calif. at Los Angeles
WILLIAM LUCAS, Stanford University
WILLIAM B. MCCOARD, University of California
J. FRED MCGREW, State Teachers College, Fresno
D. PAUL MCKELVEY, Stanford University
J. FENTON MCKENNA, San Francisco State College
GERALD E. MARSH, University of California
WILLIAM R. MORGAN, University of California
BORIS MORKOVIN, University of Southern California
H. A. NEWBY, Stanford University
ALAN NICHOLS, University of Southern California
E. RAY NICHOLS, University of Redlands
HELEN LOREE OGG, Guidance Bureau, San Diego
UPTON S. PALMER, Univ. of Calif., Santa Barbara
WILLIAM R. PARKER, University of Redlands
WALDO W. PHELPS, University of S. California
CALEB W. PRALL, University of S. California
AURORA M. QUIROS, University of California
W. CHARLES REDDING, University of S. California
C. LOUISE REYNOLDS, Compton City Schools
FAY L. RODGERS, Sturges Junior High School, San Bernadino
WADE RUBY, Pepperdine College
HOWARD L. RUNION, College of the Pacific
MADELEINE M. SEVERNANS, Unified Schools, Beverly Hills
PAUL W. SMITH, Pasadena Jr. College
JOHN C. SNIDECOR, Univ. of Calif. at Santa Barbara
GARRETT L. STARMER, Chico State College
CLARENCE J. STUBBS, University of S. California

MARIE PAVLICK STUBBS, Los Angeles Public Schools System
ANGELA SULLIVAN, University of California, Berkeley
LEE EDWARD TRAVIS, University of S. California
MARJORIE F. WALSH, University of California
CONRAD F. WEDBERG, University of S. California
JAMES DOUGLAS YOUNG, George Pepperdine School

CANADA

G. L. WARLOW, Ontario Agricultural College

COLORADO

JOHNNYE AKIN, University of Denver
ROBERT W. ALBRIGHT, University of Colorado
DOROTHY I. ANDERSON, University of Colorado
EARL C. BACH, Loretto Heights College
RAYMOND H. BARNARD, University of Denver
RUTH MILBURN CLARK, University of Denver
SETH A. FESSENDEN, Denver University
THORREL B. FEST, University of Colorado
BERT B. HANSEN, University of Denver
HELEN LANGWORTHY, Colorado State College of Education
P. MERVILLE LARSON, University of Denver
ELWOOD MURRAY, University of Denver
VERNE E. POWERS, Greeley
MARGARET ROBB, University of Colorado
EVELYN SEEDORF, University of Denver
SOLOMON SIMONSON, University of Denver
WOODSON TYREE, Colorado College
ROBERT D. WALLACE, University of Colorado
STANLEY B. WHEATER, University of Colorado
RICHARD WOELLHAF, University of Denver

CONNECTICUT

JOHN CRAWFORD, Wesleyan University
JULIE C. FARNAM, Central H. S., Bridgeport
GERALDINE GARRISON, Connecticut State Department of Education, Hartford
LILLIAN G. GRANT, Grant School of Speech Arts, Manchester
INA GUILD, Hartford Public Schools
MARY F. HENNESSY, Maloney School, Waterbury
MARY A. SPONHEIMER, Ansonia
ROBERT M. VOGEL, Trinity College

CUBA

RICARDO S. CABANAS COMAS, Hospital Mercedes

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

GRACE W. ATHERTON, Board of Education
GEORGE E. BEAUCHAMP, Executive Office of the President
MRS. HUGH BUTLER, Georgetown Junior College
BLANCHE E. DAVIS, Wilson Teachers College
REBECCA DIAL, Washington Musical Institute
ELLA F. HARLEE, The American University
GEORGE F. HENIGAN, JR., The George Washington University
RICHARD R. HUTCHESON, District Speech Clinic
RUTH PIRTLE LEE, Washington, D. C.
L. P. LEGGETTE, George Washington University
MARY FRANCES MILLER, The American University
CALVIN W. PETTIT, George Washington University
WILLIS N. PITTS, JR., Howard University
MRS. E. W. REEVES, Howard University
HENRY G. ROBERTS, George Washington University

FLORIDA

RICHARD C. BRAND, John B. Stetson University
CLAYTON C. CAMPBELL, University of Miami
H. P. CONSTANS, University of Florida
DALLAS C. DICKEY, University of Florida
CHRISTINE DRAKE, Florida State University
DELWIN B. DUSENBURY, University of Florida
C. W. EDNEY, Florida State University
WAYNE C. EUBANK, University of Florida
CONRAD W. FREED, Air University, Tyndall Field
LESTER L. HALE, University of Florida
THOMAS R. LEWIS, University of Miami
CHARLES LIGHTFOOT, School of Aviation Medicine, Pensacola
MARGARET C. MCCLELLAN, University of Florida
MRS. SHEILA GRAHAM MORRISON, University of Florida
EDWARD NEWMAN, Florida State University
CHARLES W. PHILHOUR, JR., University of Miami
CORINNE HOLT RICKERT, University of Miami
ROBERT T. RICKERT, University of Miami
JULIA M. WICKERSHAM, Jacksonville

GEORGIA

LOUISE D. DAVISON, Davison School of Speech Correction, Atlanta
KENNETH R. ERFFT, Shorter College
MARSEILLE A. QUINNEY, Georgia State College
LOUISE A. SAWYER, Georgia State Woman's College
CAROLYN VANCE, University of Georgia
EDNA WEST, Georgia State College for Women

HAWAII

CLIFTON CORNWELL, JR., University of Hawaii
RUTH P. KENTZLER, University of Hawaii
HENRIETTA KRANTZ, University of Hawaii
MRS. VALENTINE K. LARSON, University of Hawaii
VIRGINIA LEACH, Department of Health, Honolulu
ALETHEA S. MATTINGLY, University of Hawaii
ORA LEE NELSON, McKinley High School
ROSETTA V. RAMSEY, University of Hawaii
CLARENCE T. SIMON, University of Hawaii
JOSEPH F. SMITH, University of Hawaii
MELVIN R. WHITE, University of Hawaii

IDAHO

MARNA HOLM, Ricks College
WILLIAM C. KAUFFMAN, Ricks College
LEROY E. KING, Sugar-Salem High Sch., Sugar City
EARL PRIDDY, Coeur d'Alene High School
MEL SCHUBERT, Idaho State College

ILLINOIS

W. W. ADAMS, University of Illinois
JEANETTE O. ANDERSON, Rockford College
C. C. ARENDS, Elmhurst College
MRS. EDWIN ASMANN, Chicago
H. KOEPP BAKER, University of Illinois
G. BRADFORD BARBER, Illinois State Normal University
MARJORIE L. BAUMGARTEN, N. Ill. State T. C.
C. C. BENDER, Champaign
ROGER B. BERNHARDT, University of Illinois
FRANC BERRY, J. Sterling Morton Junior College
MILDRED F. BERRY, Rockford College
MARY BLACKBURN, Comm. H. S., Granite City
BETTY BOBP, University of Chicago
WESLEY G. BOVINET, Du Quoin High School
RICHARD J. BRETT, Waukegan Township High School
ALBERT J. CROFT, Northwestern University
FRANCES YOUNG CULLINAN, Loyola University, Chicago
E. THAYER CURRY, University of Illinois, Urbana
OTTO LOEB DIETER, University of Illinois

W. E. Donnelly, Knox College
Lloyd P. Dudley, Illinois College
Clara Axie Dyer, Chicago
Dorathy Eckelmann, Illinois State Normal Univ.
Davis Edwards, University of Chicago
Grant Fairbanks, University of Illinois
Donley F. Fedderson, Northwestern University
Geraldine K. Fergen, Bloomington Public Schools
Theodore Fuchs, Northwestern University
Cameron W. Garbutt, Southern Illinois Univ.
Madeleine Glynn, Public High Schools, Chicago
Halbert E. Gulley, University of Illinois
Kenneth G. Hance, Northwestern University
Howard C. Hansen, MacMurray College
Leona Heinle, Eureka College
Marie Hochmuth, University of Illinois
E. Terry Holman, Illinois Children's Hospital-School, Chicago
F. Lincoln D. Holmes, Illinois State Normal Univ.
Fred Holt, College of St. Francis, Joliet
Mrs. Jewell L. Hopkins, Carbondale Public Schools
Lee S. Hultzen, University of Illinois
Theodore V. Kundrat, DePaul University
Robert A. Lang, Northwestern University
Charlotte I. Lee, Northwestern University
John P. Leland, Knox College
Jean Liedman, Monmouth College
Thomas V. Liske, Quigley Seminary, Chicago
A. Tress Lundman, University of Illinois
James H. McBurney, Northwestern University
W. Howard McIlrath, Illinois Wesleyan Univ.
Nancy E. McKaig, University of Illinois, Urbana
Priscilla L. McQueen, Tiskilwa
Clara Krefting Mawhinney, Bradley University
Glen E. Mills, Northwestern University
Charles E. A. Moore, Proviso Twp. High School, Broadview
Paul Moore, Northwestern University
Elbert R. Moses, Jr., Eastern Illinois State T. C.
Henry L. Mueler, University of Illinois, Urbana
Richard Murphy, University of Illinois
Severina E. Nelson, University of Illinois
Laurence E. Norton, Bradley University
Clarence L. Nystrom, Wheaton College
William V. O'Connell, Northern Illinois State Teachers College
Pierce C. Ommanney, Evanston H. S. & Community College
Cullen B. Owens, University of Illinois
W. M. Parrish, University of Illinois
Ernest H. Reed, International Harvester Company
Melba Reid, Waukegan Township High School
Karl F. Robinson, Northwestern University
William J. Russell, Northwestern University
George P. Scharf, University of Illinois
Leo Shapiro, Anti-Defamation League, Chicago
Howard E. Shuman, University of Illinois
Anna Hawekotte Smith, Barat College
George-William Smith, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago
Fred S. Sorrenson, Illinois State Normal University
Wesley Swanson, University of Illinois
C. Horton Talley, Southern Illinois University
Marjorie M. Thomas, Northwestern University
Robert E. Thompson, Rosary College
Wayne N. Thompson, Chicago Div., Univ. of Ill.
R. C. Tomlinson, Lake Forest College
Lillian Thorson, Alton
Lola Walker, Evanston
Karl R. Wallace, University of Illinois
Otis M. Walter, Jr., University of Illinois
Louise K. Willhour, American Conservatory of Music, Chicago
Karl A. Windesheim, University of Illinois
Doris Yoakum Twitchel, DeKalb

INDIANA

Bernard A. Anderson, Indiana University
N. B. Beck, Purdue University
Cole Brembeck, Manchester College
W. Norwood Brigance, Wabash College
Gray Burdin, Butler University
Robert S. Cathcart, Purdue University
Eugene C. Chenoweth, Indiana University
Harvey Cromwell, Purdue University
J. Edwin Culbertson, Indiana University
Mariam H. Donewald, Evansville Public Schools
Clarence H. Edwards, Evansville College
William J. Elsen, Notre Dame University
Josephine Alcinda Evans, Lincoln School, Terre Haute
R. Jane Gasaway, E. Chicago Public Schools
Darrell H. Gooch, Thomas Carr Howe High School, Indianapolis
James F. Hawker, Peru Sr. High School
Philip N. Hood, Indiana University
Alan W. Huckleberry, Ball State Teachers College
E. Orville Johnson, Earlham College
Alfred K. Jones, George Washhington High School, Indianapolis
Vera Elaine Kellogg, LaPorte High School
James C. Kelly, Purdue University
Thelma A. Knudson, South Bend Schools
J. Daniel Kocher, Franklin College, Franklin
Ralph C. Lawson, Purdue University
Robert W. Masters, Indiana State Teachers College
Jere C. Mickel, Canterbury College
Alan H. Monroe, Purdue University
Lee Norvelle, Indiana University
Melvin E. Pape, Indiana University
John E. Paul, Purdue University
Victor M. Powell, Wabash College
Winnifred Ray, Wiley High School, Terre Haute
Herbert A. Rehner, Indiana State Teachers College
George P. Rice, Jr., Butler University
Raymond G. Smith, Indiana University
Leonard Sommer, Notre Dame University
Lawrence Stine, Butler University
M. D. Steer, Purdue University
John S. Umble, Goshen College
Roy H. Umble, Goshen College
Hortense Unger, Taylor University
Charles H. Walters, Butler University

IOWA

A. Craig Baird, State University of Iowa
Lowery LeRoy Cowperthwaite, State Univ. of Ia.
Harold Crain, University of Iowa
James F. Curtis, State University of Iowa
Carl Dallinger, University of Dubuque
Marianne Dunn, Jacksonville Public Schools
Donald H. Ecroyd, State University of Iowa
James J. Fiderlick, Drake University
Ernest C. Fossum, Iowa State Teachers College
Clara Mae Frederick, Cedar Rapids Public Schools
Max E. Fuller, Grinnell College
Evelyn D. Galbraith, Washington Junior College
Catherine M. Griesel, Burlington H. S. & Junior College

Dorothy Hinde, University of Dubuque
Velma Bissell Hiser, Grinnell College
Orville A. Hitchcock, State University of Iowa
Paul Hunsinger, Morningside College, Sioux City
Wendell A. Johnson, State University of Iowa
Hattie Jones, Drake University
Jack Hall Lamb, State University of Iowa
Sybil V. Lamb, Dubuque Senior High School
Paulus Lange, Iowa State College
Gladys E. Lynch, State University of Iowa
Elaine McDavitt, Iowa State Teachers College
E. C. Mabie, State University of Iowa
Ralph A. Micken, Iowa State College
Hazel E. Moritz, Grinnell College
Gregg Phifer, State University of Iowa
Robert L. Richey, University of Iowa
Ray H. Sandefur, State University of Iowa
Hugh F. Seabury, State University of Iowa
Fredrica Shattuck, Iowa State College
Waunita T. Shaw, Drake University
Carmen Sherman, Grinnell College
D. C. Spriestersbach, State University of Iowa
Virgilia Wade, Simpson College
Chester J. Webb, Cornell College
Reta L. West, Burlington Junior College
R. D. Wilderman, Wartburg College
Margaret Wood, State University of Iowa

KANSAS

Margaret L. Anderson, University of Kansas
E. C. Buehler, University of Kansas
Don S. Dixon, University of Kansas
Kim Giffin, University of Kansas
Earl G. Hoover, Kansas State College
Leola S. Horowitz, University of Kansas
Martin F. Palmer, Inst. of Logopedics, Wichita
George R. R. Pflaum, Kansas State Teachers Coll.
Ralph Schwartz, American Red Cross, McPherson
Forest L. Whan, University of Wichita
William T. Wilkoff, Bethel College
Donald M. Williams, University of Wichita
Norma G. Williams, Liberal High School
George D. Wilner, University of Wichita

KENTUCKY

Earl W. Blank, Berea College
Gifford Blyton, Guignol Theatre, University of Kentucky
Wallace Neal Briggs, University of Kentucky
William Jay Foley, Berea College
Charles A. McGlon, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Russell H. Miller, Western Kentucky State College
Miriam J. Robinson, Baptist Woman's Missionary Union
Argus Tresidder, Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Louisville
Bob Williamson, Station WMIK, Middlesboro

LOUISIANA

Waldo W. Braden, Louisiana State University
Robert B. Capel, Northwestern State College
Albert L. Capuder, Southwestern La. Institute
Edith Dabney, Louisiana State University
Margaret Eckhart Faulk, Crowley
Giles W. Gray, Louisiana State University
Helen Stewart Harrison, Louisiana State University
Harriett Idol, Louisiana State University
Henry H. Mamet, Tulane University
Francine Merritt, Louisiana State University
Roy D. Murphy, Southwestern Louisiana Institute
Vera A. Paul, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
W. Fredric Plette, Northwestern State College
Claude L. Shaver, Louisiana State University
Irma Stockwell, Northwestern State College
Lawrence Voss, Louisiana State University
H. Waldo Wasson, Southwestern Louisiana Inst.
Wesley Wiksell, Louisiana State University
C. M. Wise, Louisiana State University

MAINE

Therese Irene Dumais, University of Maine
Wofford G. Gardner, University of Maine
Mrs. Arthur J. Stevens, University of Maine
Phyllis Dirks Williamson, University of Maine

MARYLAND

Merle Ansberry, University of Maryland
William W. Evans, U. S. Naval Academy
Philip J. Glasner, Johns Hopkins Hospital
William G. Hardy, Johns Hopkins Hospital
Mrs. Dorothy W. McDonald, University of Maryland
Winifred Opgrande, Washington College
Gertrude Reinbold, St. Mary's Female Seminary
Marion P. Robinson, Goucher College
Martha C. Stone, University of Maryland
W. Fletcher Tarr, Washington Missionary College

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph G. Brin, Boston University
Edgar L. DeForest, Suffolk University
Ellen K. Donohue, Veteran's Administration, Boston
Jeanmary Durant, Newburyport High School
Ruth D. Elder, Tufts College
Inez E. Hegarty, Wellesley College
Helen B. Lee, Newton High School
Margaret A. McElroy, Hingham Public Schools
Alice W. Mills, Mount Holyoke College
Wilbert Pronovost, Boston University
Agnes M. Reardon, Lynn Public Schools
Nadine Shepardson, Mount Holyoke College
Vera A. Sickels, Smith College
Delbert M. Staley, The Staley College of the Spoken Word
Clarice Tatman, Mount Holyoke College

MICHIGAN

Waldo Abbot, University of Michigan
Edward S. Avison, Hope College
Paul D. Bagwell, Michigan State College
Tom C. Battin, University of Michigan
Raymond S. Beard, Wayne University
Albert B. Becker, Western Michigan College of Education
Clara M. Behringer, University of Michigan
Jack E. Bender, University of Michigan
Harlan Bloomer, University of Michigan
George V. Bohman, Wayne University
Carl G. Brandt, University of Michigan
Charles T. Brown, Western Michigan College
Donald O. Buell, Michigan State College
Hayden K. Carruth, University of Michigan
Elizabeth L. Caughran, Western Michigan College
John N. Clancy, University of Michigan
Moiree Compere, Michigan State College
A. T. Cordray, Michigan State College

RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT, Wayne University
MARY E. CRYAN, Grand Rapids Public Schools
HERBERT L. CURRY, Central Michigan College of Education
JAMES D. DAVIS, Michigan State College
G. E. DENSMORE, University of Michigan
CLYDE W. DOW, Michigan State College
MAURENE AGNES DOYLE, Evangelical Lutheran Institute for the Deaf
HAROLD DRESSEL, River Rouge Schools
MERLE A. DUNN, University of Michigan
LOUIS M. EICH, University of Michigan
J. V. GARLAND, Albion College
MARY HELEN GOFF, Michigan State College
HILDRED A. GROSS, Detroit Public Schools
LAWRENCE W. GROSSER, University of Michigan
WILLIAM P. HALSTEAD, University of Michigan
CURNEL S. HAMPTON, Michigan State College
BEATRICE HARTMAN, Highland Park Junior College
DONALD HAYWORTH, Michigan State College
JOHN M. HEAPHY, Detroit Board of Education
GEORGE L. HINDS, Wayne University
FREDERICK R. HOWE, Michigan State College
MAE LOUISE JANE, St. Clair High School
STANLEY N. KINNEY, Michigan State College
BERNARD J. KNITTEL, Michigan State College
GEORGE A. KOPP, Wayne University
HARRIET GREEN KOPP, Birmingham Board of Education
RUSSELL W. LEMBKE, Central Michigan College
LEONARD LEONE, Wayne University
ANNA E. LINDBLOM, W. Michigan Coll. of Education
MERRILL WARD MCCLATCHEY, University of Michigan
ANNE M. MCGURK, Michigan State College of Education
EDWARD J. MAJESKE, Sacred Heart Academy, Detroit
JAMES A. MCMONAGLE, Wayne University
ERNEST MADDOCK, Maddock Foundation, Dexter
J. D. MENCHHOFER, Michigan State College
N. EDD MILLER, University of Michigan
WILBUR E. MOORE, Central Michigan College of Education
LUCIA C. MORGAN, Michigan State College
JACK W. MURPHY, Western Michigan College
CECIL H. NICKLE, Michigan State College
L. LAMONT OKEY, University of Michigan
LYNN E. ORR, Wayne University
DAVID W. PARKER, Wayne University
MEREL PARKS, Speech Correction Dept., Detroit
WILSON B. PAUL, Michigan State College
MARYANNA PEARSE, Wayne University
DOROTHY W. PERKINS, Dowagiac City Schools
EMIL R. PFISTER, Central Michigan College of Education
WILLIAM M. PITKIN, Michigan State College
JAMES H. PLATT, Michigan State College
ROLLIN W. QUIMBY, University of Michigan
EMMETT LEE RANEY, Central Michigan College
WILFERD P. RAYNER, Jackson Junior College
PAUL B. RICKARD, Wayne University
FOREST A. ROBERTS, Northern Michigan College of Education
WESTLEY ROWLAND, Alma College
RANDALL RUECHELLE, Michigan State College
JOHN W. SATTLER, Michigan State Normal
WILLIAM M. SATTLER, University of Michigan
THOMAS M. SAWYER, JR., University of Michigan
WILLIAM SCHRIER, Hope College
E. RAY SKINNER, Wayne University
MARJORIE G. SMITH, Cass Technical H. S., Detroit
JIM BOB STEPHENSON, Highland Park Junior Coll.
MARION F. STOWE, Michigan State Normal School
GAIL TOUSEY, Wayne University
W. N. VIOLA, Pontiac Senior High School

MINNESOTA

EVAN E. ANDERSON, Gustavus Adolphus College
T. O. ANDRUS, University of Minnesota
K. BERNER DAHLEN, Augsburg College
FRANCIS E. DRAKE, University of Minnesota
HOWARD GILKINSON, University of Minnesota
ELIZABETH GJERVIK, Memorial High School, Ely
RAYMOND J. HAPPE, South St. Paul High School
ERNEST HENRIKSON, University of Minnesota
MASON A. HICKS, St. Cloud State Teachers College
THOMAS D. HOUCHIN, Crippled Children's Services, St. Paul
WILLIAM SMILEY HOWELL, University of Minnesota
JOHN V. IRWIN, University of Minnesota
V. ARTHUR KOIVMAKI, Winona Sr. High School
THEODORE F. NELSON, St. Olaf College
RALPH G. NICHOLS, University of Minnesota
ESTHER J. OLSON, University of Minnesota
MARY GWEN OWEN, Macalester College
GERALD L. PHILLIPS, Hibbing High School
MAX H. POWERS, Worthington High School
AGNES RISETTER, Concordia College
WENDELL WHITE, University of Minnesota
FRANK M. WHITING, University of Minnesota
DONALD WOODS, University of Minnesota
E. W. ZIEBARTH, University of Minnesota

MISSISSIPPI

CHLOE ARMSTRONG, University of Mississippi
PAUL DICKERSON BRANDES, University of Mississippi
CHARLES M. GETCHELL, University of Mississippi
BEVERLY HODGES, Blue Mountain College
J. DALE WELSCH, Mississippi State College for Women

MISSOURI

BOWER ALY, University of Missouri
MYRTLE BEARD, Central College, Fayette
BETTY BEBOUT, Stephens College
ELBERT BOWEN, University of Missouri
EARNEST BRANDENBURG, Washington University
DONALD C. BRYANT, Washington University
RAMONA CANTON, Northwest State Teachers College
IRENE COGER, Southwest Missouri State College
SHEROD J. COLLINS, Northeast Missouri State T. C
BETTY L. COMER, St. Louis University
DORIS LOUISE DAVIS, Culver-Stockton College
MILDRED E. DAVIS, Cabool High School
JEAN CONYERS ERVIN, University of Missouri
GEORGE J. HARBOLD, University of Missouri
CECIL HELDERMAN, St. Louis Public Schools
ROBERT D. HUME, Lindenwood College
ROBERT A. JOHNSTON, St. Louis University
ADA L. LABERGE, Beaumont High School
RALPH C. LEYDEN, Stephens College
JAMES I. LORE, University of Missouri
ROBERT A. MCCORMICK, Drury College
MILDRED A. MCGINNIS, Central Institute for the Deaf
CHARLES P. PATERSON, St. Louis University
FRANK M. RARIG, University of Missouri
LOREN D. REID, University of Missouri
FORREST H. ROSE, Southeast Missouri State College
MAXINE SCHLINGMAN, St. Louis University
JEANE STERN, University City Public Schools

HAROLD C. SVANOE, Central Missouri State College
BURDETTE A. THURMAN, University of Missouri
CHARLOTTE G. WELLS, University of Missouri
HOLLIS L. WHITE, University of Missouri

MONTANA

THORA M. BAKER, Eastern Montana State Normal
RAY J. HARSHFIELD, Eastern Montana College of Education
JOHN SHEPHERD, Montana State University
SANFORD G. WHEELER, Montana State University

NEBRASKA

HAROLD L. AHRENDTS, Nebraska S. T. C., Kearney
FRANK T. ALUSOW, Hastings College
E. ROBERT BLACK, University of Nebraska
SARA F. CATTLE, University of Nebraska
MRS. ROBERT H. CONNELL, University of Nebraska
LUCILE CYPREANSEN, University of Nebraska
NORMAN J. HANSEN, Doane College
BRUCE KENDALL, University of Nebraska
DONALD F. KLINE, University of Nebraska
LEROY T. LAASE, University of Nebraska
GLO ROSE MITCHELL, Nebraska State College
DONALD OLSON, University of Nebraska
C. LOYD SHUBERT, University of Omaha
MAXINE TRAUERNICHT, University of Nebraska
JOHN H. WILEY, University of Nebraska

NEVADA

ROGER JOSEPH, Reno City Schools
GALE L. RICHARDS, University of Nevada

NEW HAMPSHIRE

JOHN E. BAIRD, University of New Hampshire
JOSEPH D. BATCHELLER, Univ. of New Hampshire
EDMUND A. CORTEZ, Univ. of New Hampshire
RAY E. KEESEY, Dartmouth College
WILLIAM TRUFANT FOSTER, Jaffrey
J. A. WINANS, Dartmouth College

NEW JERSEY

JEANETTE D. ACKERMAN, Branch Brook School, Newark
DOROTHY L. BARTON, College of St. Elizabeth
MARY G. M. BUCHANAN, Burnt Mills School
ARTHUR EISENSTADT, Rutgers University
ROWENA FAIRCHILD, Centenary Junior College
GEORGE W. FLUHARTY, Princeton Theological Seminary
VINCENT B. GRIFFIN, Bancroft School
HAROLD G. HOFFMAN, South Amboy
WILBUR S. HOWELL, Princeton University
THOMAS SETON LONG, St. Benedict's Prep. School
DARREL J. MASE, Newark State Teachers College
RICHARD C. REAGER, Rutgers University
J. WALTER REEVES, The Peddie School
VALENTINE D. ROSSILLI, Board of Education, Newark
RUTH THOMAS, Passaic Public Schools
FRANCES B. TIBBITS, Newark Public Schools
ERIK WALZ, New Jersey College for Women, Rutgers University
ANNETTA L. WOOD, State Teachers Coll., Montclair

NEW MEXICO

ROBERT E. BARTON ALLEN, University of New Mexico
FRED M. CHREIST, University of New Mexico
MARGARET LOUISE TOMLINSON, Lordsburg High School

NEW YORK

RAYMOND H. ABEL, College of the City of N. Y.
H. DARKES ALBRIGHT, Cornell University
CARROLL C. ARNOLD, Cornell University
JAMES J. BARRY, Queens College
MARVIN G. BAUER, Brooklyn College
WILLIAM AUBURN BEHL, Brooklyn College
PAUL C. BOOMSLITER, New York State College for Teachers
IRVING BRANMAN, College of the City of N. Y.
ELLA M. BRAUNLICH, Supplementary School for Lip Reading and Speech Correction
JOHN M. BROPHY, St. Joseph Seminary
HAZEL P. BROWN, New York University
MRS. LUCINDA N. BUKELEY, New York University
J. CALVIN CALLAGHAN, Syracuse University
DONALD J. CARTY, Manhattan College
JOHN CATHEY, Feagin School of Dramatic Art
GIRAUD CHESTER, Cornell University
SYLVIA STEINHARDT CHIPMAN, Phonatica Speech Improvement Camp for Children
DONALD L. CLARK, Columbia University
LEOLA M. CLARK, Southampton High School
DORIS R. CLEARY, Great Neck Public Schools
FLORINE CHRISTESEN CLEARY, Rockville Centre Public Schools
ELEANOR F. CLELAND, Nott Terrace High School, Schenectady
RICHARD F. CLEMO, Teachers College, Columbia University
HELEN HAKE CLUTTON, Yonkers School Eight
ROSLYN COCHRANE, School District, Bronx
REV. BROTHER C. CORNELIUS, Christian Brothers Academy, Syracuse
KENNETH DAMON, College of the City of New York
RUTH A. DAMON, Russell Sage College
J. T. DANIEL, State Teachers College, Geneseo
OLIVE BURCH DAVIS, Hunter College High School
WILLIAM L. DINOVIS, St. John's University
DOROTHY DOOB, Hunter College
ELNORA M. DRAFAHL, New York State Teachers College
ORMOND J. DRAKE, New York University
ESTHER HOROWITZ, New York City Schools
MELBA HURD DUNCAN, Brooklyn College
MARJORIE L. DYCKE, Performing Arts High School
RUTH BERMAN EISENBERG, Stevenson Schools, Monteford County
JON EISENSON, Queens College
JOSEF ELFENBEIN, State Teachers College, Oneonta
LEONARD FINLAN, New York University
CHARLES A. FRITZ, New York University
WILBUR E. GILMAN, Queens College
BERNARD J. GOLDSTEIN, Columbia University
EVELYNE F. GORDON, New York City Public Schools
JAMES S. GREENE, National Hospital for Speech Disorders, New York City
CYRIL F. HAGER, Syracuse University
ROBERT HETHMON, Cornell University
EVELYN M. HILL, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn
C. BISHOP JOHNSON, Mount Vernon
DOROTHY HOPKINS KIRKLAND, Emma Willard School
KATHERINE KING, Queens College
EDGAR L. KLOTEN, Fordham University
EVELYN KONIGSBERG, Richmond Hill High School
MAGDALENE KRAMER, Teachers College, Columbia University
DANIEL KREMPEL, New York City
JOSEPH A. KUHN, Long Beach High School

EDWARD J. LAHERTY, Jamaica High School
MURIEL G. LEAHY, Grover Cleveland High School, Ridgewood
EDNA C. LENNOX, Houghton College
GARRETT H. LEVERTON, Samuel French & Co., N. Y.
HELEN J. LEVINSON, Flushing
DOROTHY MACKINNON, Brooklyn
LOUIS A. MALLORY, Brooklyn College
RUTH B. MANSER, New York University
WILLARD B. MARSH, Hamilton College
ELMER L. MCCARTY, New York University
J. EDWARD MCEVOY, Syracuse University
MARY T. MCGRATH, New Utrecht High School, Brooklyn
ELEANOR MCLELLAN, New York City
EDWARD MEISTER, Samuel Gompers Vocational H. S., New York City
ROSLYN J. MENDELL, New York City Schools
JOHN D. MITCHELL, Manhattan College
YETTA G. MITCHELL, New York University
ARTHUR G. MULLIGAN, Cardinal Hayes H. S., Bronx
LOUISE R. NELSEN, Brooklyn College
ORDEAN G. NESS, Syracuse University
VIRGINIA R. NEWFIELD, New York City
JOHN B. NEWMAN, Queens College
INEZ NORMAN, Garden City High School
LILLIAN M. O'CONNOR, Wadleigh High School, New York City
J. M. O'NEILL, Brooklyn College
LUCILLE CALVERT PALLEN, New York Univ., Washington Square College
WILLIAM G. PEACHER, Syracuse University
MARYANN PEINS, New York Univ., Washington Square College
R. CORBIN PENNINGTON, College of the City of New York
LINDSEY S. PERKINS, Brooklyn College
RUTH E. POLSON, Ithaca
EVELYN B. PORGES, Junior High School, New York City
ISABELLE C. RAMEL, Mepham High School, Bellmore, L. I.
LETITIA RAUBICHECK, New York City Schools
ROBERT F. RAY, Albany
OTA THOMAS REYNOLDS, Hunter College
MARIE J. ROBINSON, Syracuse University
H. RAYMOND ROSS, New York University
LOUSENE G. ROUSSEAU, Harper & Brothers, N. Y. C.
EARL H. RYAN, College of the City of New York
CARLETON E. SAUNDERS, JR., Cortland State T. C.
DAVID G. SCHAAL, State Teachers College Potsdam
RALPH N. SCHMIDT, Syracuse Univ., Utica College
JACK SCHWARTZ, Columbia University
RITA V. SCOTT, State Teachers College, Geneseo
ARTHUR SECORD, Brooklyn College
LEO SHAPIRO, Anti-Defamation League, New York City
MARY AGNES SHEA, St. Joseph's College for Women
ANDREW W. SHOOK, New York University
C. DURYEA SMITH, Alfred University
HERBERT L. SMITH, Syracuse University
LORETTA WAGNER SMITH, Brooklyn College
MARY NOBLE SMITH, Teachers College, Cortland
MILTON SMITH, Columbia University
JOSEPH T. V. SNEE, Cathedral College
WALTER H. STAINTON, Cornell University
RHODA M. SUTTA, Hofstra College
JANE BLISS TAYLOR, Hunter College
BARBARA THAYER, Union Endicott High School, Endicott
CHARLES K. THOMAS, Cornell University
LESTER THONSSEN, College of the City of New York
EDWARD THORLAKSON, New York University
STANLEY D. TRAVIS, University of Buffalo
GEORGIANA VON TORNOW, Fredonia State Teachers College
HOWARD W. TOWNSEND, Brooklyn College
RICHARD H. TURNER, New York University
EUGENE VASILEW, University of Buffalo
CLARA B. WEIR, Ithaca College
NICHOLAS EDMUND WESTHOF, St. John's University
ARLEIGH B. WILLIAMSON, New York University
NEVA M. WRIGHT, Lindenhurst High School
HENRY C. YOUNGERMAN, Syracuse University
ROSALINE B. ZANKEL, Brooklyn College
JANE DORSEY ZIMMERMAN, Columbia University

NORTH CAROLINA

NORMAN W. MATTIS, University of North Carolina
ESTHER L. SCHWERMAN, Duke University
JOSEPH C. WETHERBY, Duke University

NORTH DAKOTA

EDNA GILBERT, State Teachers College, Minot
JOHN S. PENN, University of North Dakota
DEAN WENSTROM, State Teachers College, Minot
LEONE M. WESTOVER, State Teachers College, Dickinson

OHIO

STANLEY AINSWORTH, Ohio State University
ELIZABETH ANDERSCH, Ohio University
J. JEFFERY AUER, Oberlin College
JOHN W. BLACK, Kenyon College
PAUL CARMACK, Ohio State University
AMY BISHOP CHAPIN, Western Reserve University
JAY CHERRY, Franklin County Society for Crippled Children, Columbus
WILLIAM C. CRAIG, College of Wooster
GLADYS L. CRISWELL, Cincinnati Public Schools
LIONEL CROCKER, Denison University
KELLEY W. DANFORD, Ohio Wesleyan University
W. ROY DIEM, Ohio Wesleyan University
J. GARBER DRUSHAL, College of Wooster
BERT EMSLEY, Ohio State University
ROBERT G. GUNDERSON, Oberlin College
WARREN GUTHRIE, Western Reserve University
J. ALAN HAMMACK, Cuyahoga Falls High School
ELIZABETH ASH HAWK, Toledo Public Schools
CLAIR HENDERLIDER, Western Reserve University
JOHN H. HEPLER, Ohio Wesleyan University
ELIZABETH J. HITTLE, Akron
R. C. HUNTER, Ohio Wesleyan University
RUTH BECKEY IRWIN, Ohio State Department of Education, Columbus
CLAUDE E. KANTNER, Ohio University
VINCENT S. KLEIN, John Carroll University
FRANKLIN H. KNOWER, Ohio State University
LOUIS P. KRAUSS, Western Reserve University
A. C. LAFOLLETTE, Ohio University
CHARLES LAYTON, Muskingum College
RUTH LUNDIN, Western Reserve University
ADELINE E. MCCLELLAND, Bowling Green State University
LOWELL G. MCCOY, Ohio State University
CLARK S. MARLOR, Miami University
RALPH E. MEAD, Bowling Green State University
C. W. MEDWICK, JR., Western Reserve
A. ELIZABETH MILLER, Youngstown Public Schools
HORTENSE MOORE, Miami University
KATHARINE MOORE NORTON, Kent State University

HOWARD C. MORGAN, Capital University
HENRY MICHAEL MOSER, Ohio State University
KATHERINE MOORE NORTON, Kent State University
HAROLD B. OBEE, Bowling Green State University
MARY QUIRK, Dayton Public Schools
ROBERT J. RGBBINS, Denison University
VIRGINIA S. SANDERSON, Ohio State University
BERNARD B. SCHLANGER, Marietta College
EVERETT M. SCHRECK, Ohio State University
VENTON H. SCOTT, Western Reserve University
EDWARD E. SHULMAN, Ohio State University
CONCETTA SIENA, Western Reserve University
CLAUDE SIFRITT, Ohio State University
JOHN F. SMITH, Otterbein College
LORIN C. STAATS, Ohio University
E. TURNER STUMP, Kent State University
HARRISON B. SUMMERS, Ohio State University
WILLIAM E. UMBACH, Case Institute of Technology
FREDERICK G. WALSH, Bowling Green State Univ.
EUGENE E. WHITE, Western Reserve University
EARL W. WILEY, Ohio State University
HARRY M. WILLIAMS, Miami University
LORAINE WILSON, Cleveland Public Schools
W. HAYES YEAGER, Ohio State University

OKLAHOMA

MILDRED ALLEN, Norman
EARL E. BRADLEY, Panhandle A. & M. College
LESTER R. BRENIMAN, Oklahoma City University
CARL B. CASS, University of Oklahoma
DOROTHY FRIEND, University of Oklahoma
CHARLES P. GREEN, University of Oklahoma
RUTH HANTHORNE, Seminole High School
JOHN W. KELTNER, University of Oklahoma
JOHN W. KEYS, University of Oklahoma
T. W. MCCOWN, University of Oklahoma
IRA G. MORRISON, Phillips University
CARL RITZMAN, University of Oklahoma
JAMES ROBINSON, Northeastern State College
MRS. HAL WOODS, Oklahoma County Health Ass'n

OREGON

ROBERTA B. BLOMQUIST, Klamath Union H. S., Klamath Falls
ROBERT D. CLARK, University of Oregon
DOROTHY CLIFFORD, Vanport Extension Center
CARL W. FULLER, Oregon State College
CARO C. HATCHER, Children's Hospital School, Eugene
R. D. MAHAFFEY, Linfield College
ROY C. MCCALL, University of Oregon
KIRT E. MONTGOMERY, University of Oregon
WILLIAM A. NAIL, Oregon State College
E. RAY NICHOLS, JR., University of Oregon
WILLIAM E. SCHLOSSER, University of Oregon
THELMA R. SHERMAN, Oregon State College
EARL W. WELLS, Oregon State College
KENNETH SCOTT WOOD, University of Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA

FRANK P. BAKES, University of Pennsylvania
PAUL R. BEALL, Pennsylvania State College
PATTERSON D. BENNER, Lehigh University
ESTHER K. BLACK, Geneva College
ABIGAIL C. BOARDMAN, State Teachers Coll., Indiana
JUDITH BOTTOLFSEN, The Devereux Foundation, Devon
C. CORDELIA BRONG, Pennsylvania State College
IRWIN BROWN, Temple University
JANETTE M. BURNS, State Teachers College, Slippery Rock
MARGARET C. BYRNE, Mount Mercy College
ELRICK H. CAUGHEY, Geneva College, New Brighton
HUBERT V. CORDIER, Allegheny College
VIRGINIA W. CRANDALL, State Teachers College, California
RUTH CURTIS, State Teachers College, Lock Haven
HELEN V. CUSHMAN, Westminster College
DAVID M. DAVIS, Temple University
H. BARRETT DAVIS, Lehigh University
MILDRED ANN DITTY, Allegheny College
JOHN DOLMAN, JR., University of Pennsylvania
JOHN T. DREIER, Pittsburgh
CHARLES R. ELLIOTT, Pennsylvania State College
ROBERT W. ENSLEY, State Teachers Coll., Indiana
RUTH R. HAUN, University of Pittsburgh
KARL J. HINNERSCHIETZ, Allentown
GORDON F. HOSTETTLER, Temple University
JOHN W. HULBURT, Allegheny College
ARMAND L. HUNTER, Temple University
HELEN IRWIN, Seton Hill College, Greensburg
WILLIAM P. JENKINS, Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh
ALICE JOHNSTON, State Teachers Coll., Bloomsburg
DAVID P. KAPLAN, Temple University
ELLEN KAUFFMAN, Abington Township Schools
DAVID E. MACARTHUR, Westminster College
REV. H. E. MALONE, King's College
KATHRYN B. MARTIN, Warren High School
JACK MATTHEWS, University of Pittsburgh
GEORGE A. MCCALMON, Carnegie Institute of Technology
JOSEPH F. O'BRIEN, Pennsylvania State College
WILLIAM H. OLSON, Bradford Senior High School
GEORGIANA PEACHER, Veterans Administration, Philadelphia
HARVEY J. POPE, University of Pittsburgh
NORMA J. RENO, University of Pittsburgh
JOHN B. ROBERTS, Temple University
FRED C. ROBIE, University of Pittsburgh
CLAYTON H. SCHUG, Pennsylvania State College
EDITH WARMAN SKINNER, Carnegie Institute of Technology
ROMULO R. SOLDEVILLA, Temple University
RUTH ANN SYDNEY, University of Pittsburgh
WILLIAM S. TACEY, University of Pittsburgh
MILDRED BEARD WERTZ, Pennsylvania State College
BUELL B. WHITEHILL, JR., University of Pittsburgh
HAROLD P. ZELKO, Pennsylvania State College
M. THELMA ZUTAVERN, Devereux Schools

RHODE ISLAND

SPENCER DAVIS, Rhode Island State College

SOUTH CAROLINA

HAZEL B. ABBOTT, Converse College
MARGARET K. BUQUOI, Winthrop College
JEAN LOWREY, Woman's College of Furman University
JEAN PINNER, Greenville

SOUTH DAKOTA

CHARLOTTE BRADSHAW, Kimball Consolidated H. S.
ALPHUS R. CHRISTENSEN, S. Dakota State College
LESLIE E. DAVIS, Sioux Falls College
W. FERRON HALVORSON, Director of WACT, Rapid City
ELBERT W. HARRINGTON, Univ. of South Dakota
RICHARD A. HILDRETH, Hot Springs High School
LAVINA J. HUMBERT, Black Hills Teachers College

HAROLD M. JORDAN, University of South Dakota
WARREN M. LEE, University of South Dakota
DON RASMUSSEN, Huron College

TENNESSEE

JOSEPHINE ALLENSWORTH, Memphis City Schools
BATSELL BARRETT BAXTER, David Lipscomb College
REBEKAH MARION COHEN, Central H. S., Memphis
BETTY MAY COLLINS, Memphis Tech. High School
CECIL E. HINKEL, University of Tennessee
ARTHUR L. KALTENBORN, JR., University of Tennessee
JOHN EDWARD LANTZ, Vanderbilt University
JENNIE LORENZ, Milligan College
ELIZABETH C. *MacLEARIE*, State Dept. of Education, Nashville.
INA RUTH MASSEY, Oak Ridge High School
JUDITH MAYES, Cumberland University
IRA NORTH, David Lipscomb College
DAVID C. PHILLIPS, University of Tennessee
THOMAS E. POAG, *Tennessee* A & I State College
EARL HOBSON SMITH, Lincoln Memorial University
PAUL L. SOPER, University of Tennessee
GEORGE TOTTEN, Southwestern College
LILLIAN W. VOORHEES, Fisk University

TEXAS

M. ELTON ABERNATHY, Texas State Teachers Coll.
WILLIE BURKE ANDERSON, Booker T. Washington High School, Dallas
AMY V. ALLEN, Texas State College for Women
GENEVIEVE ARNOLD, University of Houston
JAMES G. BARTON, Southwest Texas State College
MYRTISS BROOKS, Lamar Junior College
EARL C. BRYAN, Texas State College for Women
MRS. EVA G. CURRIE, University of Texas
JULIETTE McINTOSH GRATKE, Cerebral Palsy Treatment Center, Dallas
WILHELMINA G. HEDDE, Adamson H. S., Dallas
JENNIE LOUISE HINDMAN, Hardin College
ELIZABETH M. HUNT, Stephen F. Austin State College
ALBERT E. JOHNSON, University of Texas
EMILY E. JOY, Weslaco High School
HELEN A. LINDELL, Texas Technological College
SARA LOWREY, Baylor University
JYM MOTHERAL McKAY, University of Texas
JESSIE MILLSAPPS, Millsapps School of Speech & Clinic, Houston
WILLIAM A. MOORE, West Texas State College
JOHN CAMPBELL PARKER, Parker Foundation, Dallas
ANNAH JO PENDLETON, Texas Tech. College
EDWARD L. PROSS, Texas Christian University
EDYTH M. RENSHAW, Southern Methodist University
THOMAS D. RISHWORTH, University of Texas
JOSH P. ROACH, Texas State College for Women
THOMAS A. ROUSSE, University of Texas
THEODORE SKINNER, Texas A. & I. College
ELLEN McCARTER STEWART, Ellen McCarter Stewart Speech School, Houston
CRANNELL TOLLIVER, West Texas State College
JESSE J. VILLARREAL, University of Texas
JACK H. WALKER, West Texas State College, Canyon
JOHN N. WATSON, Texas Christian University
J. CLARK WEAVER, Texas State Coll. for Women
HAROLD WEISS, Southern Methodist University
LIN WELCH, West Texas State College
JOE ANN WHITMIRE, University of Texas
CHASE S. WINFREY, Texas College of Arts & Industries

UTAH

C. LAVERNE BANE, University of Utah
PRESTON R. GLEDHILL, Brigham Young University
WALLACE A. GOATES, University of Utah
HALBERT GREAVES, University of Utah
BURRELL F. HANSEN, Utah State College
GEORGE L. LEWIS, Brigham Young University
ALBERT O. MITCHELL, University of Utah
ALONZO J. MORLEY, Brigham Young University
SUSIE S. NILES, Salt Lake City Schools
JOHN L. OWEN, Elder High School, Brigham City
T. EARL PARDOE, Brigham Young University
GAIL PLUMMER, University of Utah
MARY J. WEBSTER, University of Utah
VALOIS A. ZARR, East High School, Salt Lake City

VERMONT

ROBERT B. HUBER, University of Vermont
ROBERT KLEIN, Goddard College
ELEANOR LUSE, University of Vermont
ERIE T. VOLKERT, Middlebury College

VIRGINIA

BENJAMIN S. ANDREWS, University of Virginia
ROGER BOYLE, University of Virginia
IDA ULLMAN BROWN, Alexandria
DOUGLAS EHNINGER, University of Virginia
ELIZABETH GREENE, Sullins College
CAROLINE HICKERSON, Middletown School
RAYMOND HODGES, College of William and Mary
MARY E. LATIMER, Madison College, Harrisonburg
JAMES M. MULLENDORE, University of Virginia
LEROY M. OBER, Virginia Institute of Effective Speaking
H. HARDY PERRITT, University of Virginia
LELAND SHUBERT, Madison College
RUSSELL H. WAGNER, University of Virginia
JOHN A. WALKER, University of Virginia
JACK W. WARFIELD, Mary Washington College
GEORGE P. WILSON, JR., University of Virginia

WASHINGTON

PERRY E. BAISLER, University of Washington
DOROTHY C. BAKER, Sunnyside Public Schools
W. W. BIRD, University of Washington
MARIE ELEANOR BRITTIN, University of Washington
SENE R. CARLILE, Western Washington College of Education
STEWART V. CRANDALL, State College of Washington
CHARLOTTE E. CLEELAND, State College of Washington.
JEANETTE G. CRANMER, Eastern Washington College of Education
ROBERT J. COX, University of Washington
LILLIAN P. DANIELSON, Seattle Pacific College
FREDERICK J. HUNTER, Whitman College
THEODORE O. H. KARL, Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland
CARL O. LUNDQUIST, Anatone High School
GRACE NEWELL MEEKER, Washington State College
ROMAINE A. PEARSON, Washington State College
ORVILLE PENCE, University of Washington
HORACE G. RAHSKOPF, University of Washington
HART E. SMITH, Roosevelt High School, Port Angeles
S. M. VINOCOUR, University of Washington

WEST VIRGINIA

EVELYN ANDERSON, West Virginia University
ROBERT B. BURROWS, West Virginia University
MARTIN T. COBIN, University of West Virginia

J. H. Henning, University of West Virginia
Ben Walter Hope, Marshall College
A. O. Ranson, Marshall College
Lillian Bennett Smith, West Liberty State College
Lloyd W. Weldon, Sr., West Virginia University
Milton J. Wiksell, Shepherd State College
Mardis Glen Wilson, Jr., West Virginia University

WISCONSIN

Wynett Barnett, State Teachers College, Whitewater
Gladys L. Borchers, University of Wisconsin
Winston L. Brembeck, University of Wisconsin
Herman H. Brockhaus, University of Wisconsin
Raymond D. Cheydleur, University of Wisconsin
L. Kirk Denmark, Beloit College
John E. Dietrich, University of Wisconsin
Marceline Erickson, The Stout Institute
H. L. Ewbank, University of Wisconsin
Paul R. Gauger, Wisconsin High School, Madison
Ruth B. Gober, State Teachers College, Platteville
Harriett Grim, University of Wisconsin
Frederick W. Haberman, University of Wisconsin
E. M. Kinney, Madison
Gordon J. Klopf, University of Wisconsin
Charles C. Major, University of Wisconsin
Dorothy Miniace, State Teachers Coll., Milwaukee
Charles M. Monnier, University of Wisconsin
Raymond H. Myers, Milwaukee Center, University of Wisconsin
Carrie Rassmussen, Madison Public Schools
Norbert R. Rodeman, University of Wisconsin
Donald K. Smith, University of Wisconsin
Lillian R. Wagner, University of Wisconsin
Grace M. Walsh, State Teachers College, Eau Claire
A. T. Weaver, University of Wisconsin
Robert W. West, University of Wisconsin

WYOMING

Richard R. Dunham, Wyoming University
Dean G. Nichols, University of Wyoming
Peter Kuchmy, Wyoming University

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Alpha Psi Omega (National Honorary Dramatic Society)
American Speakers Club, Detroit
Ball State Teachers College, Department of Speech
Boston Speech Improvement Class Teachers' Association
Eastern Illinois State Teachers College
Kansas State College of Agriculture
Kansas State Teachers College, Department of Speech
Michigan Association of Teachers of Speech
National Forensic League (High School Honor Society)
The National Thespian Society
Northern Illinois State Teachers College, Department of Speech
Omega Upsilon, Ottumwa Heights College, Ottumwa, Iowa
Pennsylvania State College for Women
Phi Beta Fraternity, Grand Rapids, Michigan
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois
Weber College
Zeta Phi Eta (National Professional Speech Fraternity for Women)